

The  
**American Historical Review**

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION AT PHILADELPHIA

THE American Historical Association has now held at least two of its annual meetings in each of the four chief centres of American population. It held at New York the meeting of 1896 and the twenty-fifth-anniversary meeting of 1909; at Boston those of 1887, 1899, and 1912; at Chicago a summer meeting of somewhat special character in 1893, at the time of the World's Fair, and meetings in December of 1904 and 1914; and has now held two meetings in Philadelphia, those of 1902 and 1917. Anyone who has attended, at the same city, or in each of them, two of these meetings, ten or fifteen years apart, has ready means of measuring the society's progress and the advancement made in the range and quality of its proceedings. It is all very gratifying, and most of all because of the rich promise it offers of still further improvement in the future.

One or two aspects of the Philadelphia meeting were, however, especially gratifying. In November and December there had been, in this as in other scientific societies, evidences of doubt in some minds as to whether it were not better, in war-time, to omit these large annual gatherings, in the interest of economy of money and effort. They are indeed expensive. They are more expensive than they should be. No local committee of arrangements likes to show the American Historical Association any but the best hotel in its city, though few there be, among the members of that worthy but impecunious fraternity, who habitually put up at the best hotels in the cities which they visit on other occasions. To be forced to stay at an expensive hotel because it is headquarters is in some respects agreeable (especially if there is a cheap restaurant near at hand!), but when we add to the cost the expense and present difficulty of railroad travel, there is much to deter us, especially in war-time, from going far to attend the meetings of a scientific

society. With the next meeting scheduled to take place in Minneapolis, the Association did prudently in voting authority to the Executive Council to omit the meeting of December, 1918, or change place and plan, if conditions attending the war develop before September in such a manner that action of this sort seems to the Council expedient.

But with the pressure of the war no further advanced than it was in December, 1917, it could fairly be said that, if the transactions of a national historical society were what they should be, they were worth to the government and the country all that they cost. No national effort of such prodigious magnitude and power as that which we are called upon to make can be made by any nation which is not fully conscious of an inspiring past. Of all the factors that make a nation, a common history is perhaps the most potent; and the present war of nations is visibly a product of history. Much knowledge of European history is necessary toward its comprehension, much thought and feeling respecting American history toward bearing successfully our part in its prosecution. A national historical society with no thoughts above the level of antiquarianism might better not convene in such days as these, but a national historical society with the right spirit could not hold an annual meeting without sending its members home heartened to the performance of every patriotic duty, nor without extending in some measure throughout the nation the inspiring and clarifying influence of sound historical thinking and right patriotic feeling.

Fortunately—though not by accident, nor with any ground for surprise—such has been the spirit and temper of the American Historical Association. It is no accident that such men wish now, more than ever, to connect their studies of the past with the life of the present, to relate every portion of history to the impending crisis of civilization, and to concentrate attention on those parts that are really significant and directly helpful, yet to do all this without allowing the judgment to be warped by the events and passions of the hour, without ceasing to see the life of the race steadily and see it whole. At the Cincinnati meeting, and still more at that lately held at Philadelphia, those who made the programme and those who took part in it advanced from the ignoring attitude of 1914 and 1915 to a frank recognition of the war as the historical event now uppermost in all minds, from ground perhaps suitable to spectators to ground appropriate for participants, and did so without excitement or partisanship or loss of judgment. Such discussions by teachers and writers are surely useful to the nation.

Not only was the meeting marked by unwonted enthusiasm, but it was attended by much greater numbers than would generally be expected in such times. The registration amounted to 379, a figure which has only a few times been surpassed. No doubt the historic and other attractions of Philadelphia were in large part responsible for this unusually great attendance. No city has so many and so important associations with the beginnings of our national life, and none has so many visible memorials of those events to attract the patriotic pilgrim. A special occasion was provided, on one of the afternoons of the session, for visits to these historic scenes of old Philadelphia and to the American Philosophical Society.

Additional numbers may well have been drawn to the meeting by Philadelphia's established fame for hospitality. Besides all that was done privately to sustain those hospitable traditions, the University of Pennsylvania, in whose buildings all the sessions of one of the three days (December 27, 28, 29) were held, entertained all members to luncheon and to supper on that day. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, in whose hall Mr. Worthington Ford delivered on the first evening his presidential address, followed that address, in its usual handsome manner, with a reception and supper. The conference of archivists and that of historical societies were held in the same building. Other sessions of the first and third days were mostly held in various rooms of the hotel chosen as official headquarters, the Bellevue-Stratford. The privileges of the College Club and of the New Century Club were extended to women members attending the meeting, those of the Franklin Inn Club to the men. The chairman of the committee on local arrangements was Mr. George Wharton Pepper, the vice-chairman Professor William E. Lingelbach, of the University of Pennsylvania, to whom, and to other professors in that university, the attending members are greatly indebted. The chairman of the committee on programme was Professor John B. McMaster, the vice-chairman Professor Herman V. Ames, of the same institution.

Other learned societies which met at the same time and place were the Archaeological Institute of America, the American Philological Society, the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Sociological Society, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and the Association of History Teachers of the Middle West and Maryland. The session on ancient history was held as a joint session with the first two of these bodies; that on medieval church history as a joint session with the American Society of Church History, which, meeting as

usual in New York, adjourned to Philadelphia for this final session; the conference of teachers of history as a joint session with the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland; while the last session of all was held in common with the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, and the American Sociological Society. At that session the members of the various societies were favored with an interesting informal address by the Honorable Robert Brand, deputy chairman of the British War Mission, well known for work connected with the federation of South Africa, on the British Commonwealth of Nations; Hon. Edward P. Costigan, of the United States Tariff Commission, read an address on Economic Alliances, Commercial Treaties, and Tariff Adjustments, partly historical in character, in so far as it touched upon the experiments of the United States in reciprocity since 1890;<sup>1</sup> and Professor Wallace Notestein, of the University of Minnesota, read a paper, at once entertaining and of solid value, on the Pan-German Use of History.

At noon of the first day, the members of the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association came together in a subscription luncheon, at which M. Louis Aubert, of the French High Commission, spoke eloquently of the aid of historians in winning the war, and Professor Guy S. Ford, of the University of Minnesota, who since May has been performing invaluable services as director of the Division of Civic and Educational Co-operation in the Committee on Public Information at Washington, described the educational work of that committee in detail and in a manner to convince all hearers of the high value of its labors. Several subscription dinners of those having a common interest in an individual field of history were arranged, in accordance with a custom which has been growing of late, and were eminently successful—a dinner of those interested in military history, one of members interested in the history of the Far East, and one of members of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. There was also a breakfast of those interested in Latin-American history and in the foundation of the new *Hispanic American Historical Review*, of whose progress announcement is made on a later page; and a subscription luncheon of teachers, at which the subject of discussion was the War and the Teaching of History, and at which an interesting letter addressed to those present by M. Édouard de Billy, French Deputy High Commissioner, was read by M. François Monod.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Costigan's paper appears in the supplement to the *American Economic Review* for March.



Though several of the sessions were entitled conferences and had in part that character, the familiar difficulty of eliciting real discussion of substantive papers confined those sessions mostly to formal written contributions; but there were, as usual, three conferences that call for independent description, the fourteenth annual conference of representatives of state and local historical societies, the ninth annual conference of archivists, and the conference of teachers of history.

The conference of historical societies now met for the first time under the constitution provided for it by the Association a year before, which gives it an autonomous status; and organized by the choice of Mr. Thomas L. Montgomery, librarian of the Pennsylvania State Library, as chairman, and of several committees. The secretary of the new organization is Dr. Augustus H. Shearer, of the Grosvenor Library, Buffalo, appointed to that position by the Council a year before. Preparations were made for the issue in 1918 of a hand-book of American historical societies. The proceedings of the conference were mainly occupied with the problem of the relations between historical societies and the various hereditary-patriotic societies, especially in the matter of co-operation in publication. Judge Norris S. Barratt, of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, read a paper on the publications issued by societies of the latter class, and the need of avoiding duplication. The plan of a joint committee, in which each such society should be represented, and which should systematize printing, and by agreement assign to each society the field and method of publication which it should adopt, was elaborated by Professor William Libbey, of Princeton University, and by Mr. Worthington C. Ford, of the Massachusetts Historical Society. It was voted that the president of the American Historical Association should be requested to appoint a committee of thirteen, representing all types of organization involved, to consider closer co-operation and report a plan for avoiding duplication of effort and securing a better and more systematic publication of historical material. For the remainder of the conference the topic was the collection by historical societies of local material on the present war; Professor Harlow Lindley and Dr. Solon J. Buck gave useful descriptions of methods pursued by the Indiana State Library and the Minnesota Historical Society respectively.<sup>2</sup>

The chief theme in the conference of archivists was the collection and preservation of war records. Mr. Waldo G. Leland, of the

<sup>2</sup> A fuller account of the proceedings, in a brief pamphlet of eight pages, has been prepared by Dr. Shearer, and may be obtained from him.

Carnegie Institution, secretary of the National Board for Historical Service, presented in outline the general subject of Archives of the War, on which he has been preparing for that board an elaborate report. He emphasized the great need of preserving properly the official documents and papers produced by the federal, state, and local governments of the Union in their various conventional departments, and showed in part what was being done in this direction, and by libraries; but he dwelt more largely on the need of preserving proper records of the doings of those newer governmental or semi-official or extra-official bodies which have been created in such numbers for purposes connected with the war. Starting without traditions of office and with instant needs for boundless activity, such organizations are likely to forget the importance of preserving for future times the records of their activities. Yet after all their achievements should hold as high and as instructive a place in the history of the war as those of all the traditional divisions of the old-line military or political mechanism, for the future historian of the war will see it, in this country as in others, as a prodigious and many-sided effort of the whole nation. What has been done to cause these newer bodies to conserve historical material was set forth by Mr. Leland in general terms, and was exemplified in a particular instance by a fuller description, presented by Mr. Everett S. Brown, of the Archives of the Food Administration as Historical Sources. Professor Peter Guilday, of the Catholic University of America, editor of the *Catholic Historical Review*, speaking to the title, the Collection of Catholic War Records, described the systematic endeavors made, on a large scale, by the War Record Committee of the Catholic National War Council, operating through 119 diocesan sub-committees, to collect all sorts of material relating to the war which can be obtained from members of the Catholic Church, the portions relating to Catholics to be preserved ultimately in a special archive building to be erected in Washington at the Catholic University of America. Professor R. M. Johnston, of Harvard, Mr. R. D. W. Connor, of North Carolina, Dr. Buck, of Minnesota, and Dr. James Sullivan, of the New York Department of History, also spoke in this conference, partly by way of describing the earnest and intelligent efforts which historical departments and societies and the historical sections of state councils of defence have made to ensure the preservation of material on the war, partly upon the pressing need, which war conditions have emphasized, for better housing of the national archives at Washington. The conference was presided over by Mr. Victor H. Paltsits, of the New York Public Library, chairman of the Public Archives Commission.

The conference of teachers of history, presided over by Dean Marshall S. Brown, of New York University, attracted an exceptionally large attendance, especially of teachers in secondary schools. It will be remembered that the Association two years ago appointed a Committee of Thirteen to consider what progress could be made toward framing for American schools a more ideal programme in history, a course which, while defining more closely the fields of history recommended by the Committee of Seven, should also bring about a better co-ordination between the elementary and the secondary schools. This conference was planned to help forward these deliberations, and the principal paper was by Professor Henry Johnson, of Teachers College, Columbia University, chairman hitherto of that Committee on History in Schools. Professor Johnson's paper, on the School Course in History: Some Precedents and a Possible Next Step, a paper expressed with his usual wisdom and felicity, and the valuable remarks of the gentlemen who followed him in the discussion of the theme, Professor Rolla M. Tryon, of the University of Chicago, Dr. Arthur M. Wolfson, of the New York High School of Commerce, Professor Henry E. Bourne, of the Western Reserve University, and Professor Herbert D. Foster, of Dartmouth University, have been printed at length in another place.<sup>3</sup> It must suffice here to say that Professor Johnson warned against the non-historical tendency to teach too much "current events", continually shifting the emphasis and interpretation of history to suit the interests of the hour, and against the temptation, active in such times as these, to turn the whole force of historical teaching to the stimulation of national patriotism—the very process which in Germany, glorifying one nation alone, has resulted in intellectual isolation from the civilization of the rest of the world. Advocating a connected programme of history for the whole school course, he especially commended as a model the French course of 1902, which endeavored to promote without bias a sympathetic understanding of the progress of humanity, and therefore attained a point of view universal and stable.

Among the formal papers read at the meetings, the place of first consideration belongs to the bright and engaging presidential address delivered by Mr. Ford, *facile princeps* among American historical editors of whatever period, on the Editorial Function in American History. We have already had the pleasure of printing its text in full.<sup>4</sup> Such summaries as we are able to give of the other

<sup>3</sup> *History Teacher's Magazine*, February, 1918, pp. 74–83, pages of great value and importance.

<sup>4</sup> *American Historical Review*, XXIII. 273–286.

papers may best be arranged in something approaching a chronological or systematic order, without regard to the order in which these papers appeared in the programme.

A group of papers in the session on ancient history discussed, in outline and suggestively, the problems of ancient imperialism, Professor Albert T. Olmstead of the University of Illinois presenting a paper on Oriental Imperialism, Professor William S. Ferguson of Harvard, one on Greek Imperialism, while a third, prepared by the late Professor George W. Botsford of Columbia University, dealt with Roman Imperialism. These three papers we expect to have the pleasure of printing in a future number of this journal.

In the same session, Professor Clifford H. Moore, of Harvard University, discussing the Decay of Nationalism under the Roman Empire, showed how the earlier patriotism of antiquity, based on the city state in the more advanced, on the tribe in the less advanced populations, never developed into a nationalism attached to a large area, before Roman conquest substituted provincial organization with its highly centralized form of government, broke up old relations, and destroyed many of the inter-city or intertribal ties. That a Roman nationalism developed under the Empire is difficult to maintain. The racial composition of the Empire, its vast extent, the early loss of political power under the principate, the individualism engendered by social and economic conditions and by philosophy and Oriental religions, caused Roman national spirit in reality to decline.

Aspects of cosmopolitan religion under the Empire were treated by Professor A. L. Frothingham of Princeton, in a paper on the Cosmopolitan Religion of Tarsus and the Origin of Mithra. He exhibited Tarsus as a typical exponent of religious cosmopolitanism, affected, by reason of its position and history, by Hittite and Anatolian ideas, by those of the Assyrians and the Persians, the Greeks and the Romans. One part of his paper essayed to show how influences from all these sources are reflected in the symbolism of the lion slaying the bull, a special device of Tarsus, and in its mythological interpretations. Another argued for the origin of Mithra in the Babylonian myth of the hero Gilgamesh. Among the comments made upon the papers in this session, especially valuable were those of Professor Frank F. Abbott, of Princeton, on the causes which broke down the individuality of the city states and brought about the decline of civic patriotism under the Roman Empire.

Professor Joseph C. Ayer, jr., of the Episcopal Divinity School

in Philadelphia, presented a paper on the Church Councils of the Anglo-Saxons. His conclusions were: (1) that the provincial conciliar system of the Church was as ineffectual and as irregular at this period in England as elsewhere; (2) that with the exception of the two provincial synods of Hertford and Hatfield under Archbishop Theodore, there were no Anglo-Saxon councils or synods representing the entire Church in England; (3) that there is no evidence, by way of church councils, of any such unity of church organization as could do much to advance the political unity of the nations in England; (4) that the earliest synods of Theodore, and probably the strictly provincial synods for some time, were called by the archbishop on his own authority, but that later it was on the king's authority that all councils, secular and ecclesiastical, were called, the church councils rapidly becoming assimilated with the witenagemot; (5) that the witenagemot took the place of the provincial synod for all ecclesiastical purposes at an early day, possibly at about 800 A. D.

In the session devoted to medieval church history, in which this paper was read, later church councils had an important place. The presidential address which Professor David S. Schaff of the Western Theological Seminary at Pittsburgh delivered before the American Society of Church History in this session was devoted to the Council of Constance, its Fame and its Failure, setting forth its personal aspects, the questions which it settled, and those which it failed to settle—the healing of the papal schism, the failure to reform the Church, or to fix the final seat of authority in ecumenical councils.

Dr. Harold J. Laski of Harvard, in a paper on the Conciliar Movement, dealt with that movement in its bearings upon fundamental political questions, still urgent: the nature of political authority, the question of sovereignty, the relation between the state and other organizations, the problems connected with representative government, and the problems of internationalism. The important question throughout the movement was that of constitutionalism against autocracy. The papacy refused to reform. The conciliar writers believed that only a constitutional government could end the evil. They were led to see that the Church is not *sui generis* but has the nature of other associations of men. The federal idea to which they came was overthrown by the conception of a sovereignty which because of its great purposes could know no limits, which refuses to admit a divided allegiance. The failure of the attempt gave birth to ultramontaniam, the parent of divine right and state-

absolutism. But even in failure, the idea that the consent of the governed is a fundamental element in government, the idea that there are rights so sacred that they must not be invaded, survived, to bear fruit later. The temporary failure was due to the secular forces of the time, demanding centralization.

In the last of the papers of ecclesiastical history, a paper on the Actual Achievements of the Reformation, Dr. Preserved Smith interpreted the reformation as a culmination of seven revolutionary processes, maturing throughout the later Middle Ages: a revolt of the national state against the ecclesiastical world-state and of Teutonism against Latin culture; the prevalence of the ideals of the bourgeoisie over those of the privileged orders; the change from a pessimistic, other-worldly order, to one optimistic and secular; the growth of individualism; the popularization of knowledge; the triumph of monotheism or monism; and the shift from a sacramental, hierarchical supernaturalism to an unconditioned, unmediated, disinterested, transcendental morality.

The special session for English medieval history was devoted to four papers on the history of English medieval taxation: by Professor William E. Lunt, of Haverford College, on Early Assessment for Papal Taxation of English Clerical Incomes; by Dr. Sydney K. Mitchell, of Yale University, on the Taxation of the Personal Property of Laymen down to 1272; by Dr. Norman S. B. Gras, of Clark University, on the English Customs Revenue to 1275; and by Professor James F. Willard, of the University of Colorado, on the Assessment of Lay Subsidies, 1290-1332.

Mr. Lunt described the valuations made in 1201, 1217, and 1229, and discussed the assessments probably used for the taxes ordered in 1238, 1239, 1245, 1246, 1247, and 1252. Tentatively, he concluded that the three valuations named were apparently the only assessments of English clerical incomes made for papal taxation previous to 1254, and that they probably included only the spiritualities and did not extend to the temporalities. The last of the three, that of 1229, was the most thorough, furnished the precedents for the methods followed in later valuations, and was probably used for the assessment of all papal taxes imposed upon the income of the English papal clergy between 1229 and 1254.

Mr. Mitchell's paper dealt with the machinery created for the new taxation of the personal property of laymen. A special exchequer, modelled after that of Westminster but independent of it, was generally established to deal with the work of each county collector. This system was followed until the time of Edward I.,

when the work was assigned to the exchequer at Westminster and the wardrobe. In the endeavors after proper valuation, many experiments were made in the local machinery, adaptations and generalizations of devices already in use in the judicial organization of the kingdom, but one feature was constant, a body of royal commissioners, appointed in each county, who had general charge of the assessment and collection of the tax.

In respect to the early history of the English customs revenue, Dr. Gras controverted the current view that the origin of the national customs had lain in a gradual development of the royal right of seizure of goods from merchants, systematized and reduced to money payments. On the contrary he believed the national system to have developed from certain definite customs already existing, through a series of clearly defined actions, in each case an episode in the struggle between localism and nationalism. Among the early taxes on trade he instanced lastage and scavage as having characteristics of national taxes, and two later taxes on wine, cornage and prisage. The decrees or assizes on which these taxes were founded have been lost, but they were all national in being based on foreign trade, imposed on alien and denizen, and apparently imposed originally by the sovereign.

Professor Willard's paper was an account of the assessment of taxes on personal property in England from 1290 to 1332. Between these two dates the system provided for the appointment in each county of groups of commissioners called taxors, in whose instructions the fundamental principle was that the personal property of each individual was to be valued by men of his neighborhood. Sub-taxors reported their data to the chief taxors, who, after general survey, summarized the information in two large rolls for the county, which were brought to the exchequer. There is some uncertainty as to the kinds of personal property which were valued, and as to whether assessments were made from the true value, but apparently there was a good deal of conventional valuation.

In a paper entitled "The Association", Dr. J. Franklin Jameson discussed the development, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, of that institution or mode of organization of which the Association of the Continental Congress, Philadelphia, 1774, is a familiar example—a signed agreement to continue in a given course of political action. He traced its English history from the association for the protection of Queen Elizabeth in 1584, to instances of loyal association of a similar sort under the Hanoverian kings,



discussed the Scottish model on which the Association of 1584 might have been founded, but showed evidences that its model was rather the Dutch Compromise of 1566, which in turn most probably had its model in the French Catholic leagues of 1560 and the years immediately following.

The most generally interesting of all the sessions was doubtless that one which was devoted to a topic uppermost at that time in most minds, recent Russian history.

In this session, Professor Alexander Petrunkevitch, of Yale University, described in an illuminating manner the role of the intellectuals in the liberating movement in Russia. The real leaders of all Russian parties are intellectuals, since they alone have intelligence to formulate the desires and dreams of the workers. The party programmes express the opinions of the leaders, not of the masses; the wording of them is in the language of educated Russia. He described the intellectual position of each of the Russian political parties and its relations to the revolution, and explained why no one of them was able to control the forces which the revolution had unloosed.

Professor Samuel N. Harper, of Chicago, speaking on Forces behind the Russian Revolution of March, 1917, dwelt chiefly upon two distinct forces, operating through two sets of institutions: political liberalism, which took the initiative, acting through already existing institutions of a somewhat popular character, especially the Duma, and radicalism of a socialistic character, claiming to represent "revolutionary democracy" as opposed to the bourgeoisie, and acting through strictly revolutionary organizations, such as the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies. The interaction of these forces, the failure of efforts toward coalition, and the chaos resulting from the triumph of revolutionary democracy, were described.

Next followed a vivid account of the First Week of the Revolution of March, 1917, by an eye-witness, Professor Frank A. Golder, of Washington State College. Adverting to the prevalence, before the war, of discontent with the government, and the frequent talk, in all circles, of the revolution that would follow soon after the war, he declared the present revolution to have been precipitated by the conduct of the Minister of the Interior. Fearing lest the revolutionary spirit should grow too powerful for the government to contend with, he instigated an uprising in order to suppress it seasonably and prevent worse outbreaks in the future, and so brought on a revolution which he was unable to control.

Finally, in a comprehensive paper on the Jugo-Slav Movement, Professor Robert J. Kerner, of the University of Missouri, traced the history of the Jugo-Slavs (Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes) through an evolution of twelve centuries, from primeval unity, through a political, economic, and social decomposition of a most bewildering character, to national unity and the present demand for political amalgamation.<sup>5</sup>

We may bridge the transition from papers of European history to papers of American history by mention of that on the Functions of an Historical Section of a General Staff, read in a section devoted to military history, by Lieutenant-Colonel Paul Azan, of the French Army. The topic gains additional interest for American historical scholars from the recent action of the War Department in creating an historical section in the General Staff of the United States Army. Colonel Azan described the archives of the French Ministry of War, the organization of the Historical Section of the General Staff, its work, and its relations to the Centre des Hautes Études Militaires and the École Supérieure de Guerre in developing the theory of war.

First among the contributions to American history mention should be made of the notable paper by Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, of the University of Chicago, on the Background of American Federalism.<sup>6</sup> Its purpose was to show, first, that the essential qualities of American federal organization were largely produced by the practices of the old British Empire as it existed before 1764, and secondly, that the discussions of the period from that time to 1787, and, more particularly, those of the ten years preceding 1776, gathered very largely around the problem of imperial organization, and, in that field, around the problem of recognizing federalism as a principle, or of discerning the nature of federal organization, in which so-called powers of government are distinguished one from another. The insistence of the colonists was on the maintenance of the old, uncentralized empire; the contention of the Parliamentarians was that a denial of a single power to the Parliament was a denial that it was possessed of any power whatsoever. The result of the actual practices of the old empire, of the argument, of the war, and of the attempted solution in the Articles of Confederation, was the emergence of the federal empire of the United States.

<sup>5</sup> It is understood that the four papers of this Russian, or Slavonic, session are to be published together, before long, in the form of a volume.

<sup>6</sup> To be printed in the *American Political Science Review* for May, 1918.

The other papers relating to the first fifty years of United States history were those read in joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. That of Professor James A. James, of Northwestern University, entitled *To What Extent was George Rogers Clark in Control of the Northwest at the Close of the Revolution*, took up that question as an essential means for determining the importance of Clark's conquests. The author related the history of Clark's designs and movements against Detroit, concluding with the results of his expeditions against the Shawnee strongholds in November, 1782, which in both British and Indian view laid Detroit open to attack.

The essay by Professor Archibald Henderson, of the University of North Carolina, on the Spanish Conspiracy in Tennessee, related to the events which ensued in the Tennessee region upon the extinction of the state of Franklin. The conspiracy was that whereby Gardoqui intrigued with John Sevier to secure the allegiance of the latter and his associates to Spain. An important letter of Sevier, from the Archives of the Indies, promising action of this nature, was read.<sup>7</sup>

In the same session, the Mission of General George Matthews on the Florida Frontier was described by Professor Isaac J. Cox, of the University of Cincinnati, who related Matthews's endeavors in 1810, as secret agent, to persuade Folch to surrender West Florida, his renewal of the attempt in the following year, his unauthorized instigation of rebellion in East Florida, his seizure of Fernandina, and the considerations which forced Madison to disavow his actions.

A paper by Professor Eugene C. Barker, of the University of Texas, on Stephen F. Austin, was devoted to a discussion of Austin's personality, as revealed in his work. His power as a leader was deduced from the control he exercised over the rapidly increasing population of his settlement throughout the whole period from 1821 to 1836, his skill as a diplomat from his ability to hold the confidence of Mexican statesmen and allay their fears of disloyalty on the part of the colonists despite the persistent efforts of the United States to buy Texas.

In a paper of much importance and value, Professor Frederick J. Turner, of Harvard University, set forth the Significance of the North Central States in the Middle of the Nineteenth Century. The points mainly dwelt upon were the relations of geography and

<sup>7</sup> Mr. Henderson's article appears in the April number of the *Tennessee Historical Magazine*.

population, the interplay and mixture of varied stocks, the influence of mid-Western agriculture, especially of wheat-farming, on both West and East, the development of business, the application of Eastern capital to banking, transportation, and commerce, the political developments and their relation to the processes of settlement and of economic growth, the formation of a new democratic society in this region, and the influence of the children of the pioneers in a wide variety of cultural fields.

Three papers dealt with the American war period of fifty years ago. Professor Louis B. Schmidt, of Iowa State College, spoke on the Influence of Wheat and Cotton on Anglo-American Relations during the Civil War. He developed in some detail Great Britain's dependence on American wheat and cotton. While the blockade withheld Southern cotton from shipment to England, Northern wheat supplied the deficit which other nations were unable to fill, and, since England had a series of crop failures in 1860, 1861, and 1862, her dependence on American wheat was most acute when the cotton famine was at its height. It may well be regarded as having contributed the decisive influence, overbalancing that of cotton, in keeping the British government from recognition of the Confederacy.

Secondly, Dr. Victor S. Clark, of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, in Notes on American Manufactures during the Civil War, explained why, though manufacturing in the South was disastrously interrupted, manufacturing at the North prospered during the period of warfare, partly because it had been brought to a stage where the plants were easily transformed into war factories, partly because of wider and more open markets. A surplus of manufactures above both civil and military needs of the nation was produced, exports to Europe were continued, and the general effect of the war was to accelerate manufacturing and to give it an impetus that was permanent until the panic of 1873.

The third of these papers was one by Professor Carl R. Fish of Wisconsin, on the Restoration of the Southern Railroads after the Civil War. He described the system under which, beginning in the spring of 1865, repairs and restoration proceeded under military authority. The reconstruction of these roads by the engineering corps of the army, on financial credit advanced through the War Department, solved the immediate transportation problem of the South, as it could have been solved in no other way. Considering the temper of the North toward the South and the American indi-

vidualist theories of the period, the process which ended in the summer of 1866 was little short of a miracle.<sup>8</sup>

In one of the evening sessions, a large audience derived much entertainment, as well as much profit, from a discourse on "A Generation of American Historiography", by Professor William A. Dunning of Columbia University, in which the progress of historical writing since the foundation of the American Historical Association in 1884 was set forth, with a light touch and with many humorous turns of phrase, but none the less with much sagacity and insight. Characterizing briefly the work of recent historians, Schouler, H. H. Bancroft, McMaster, Fiske, Henry Adams, Rhodes, Roosevelt, and others, he also exhibited the new factors and features of this latest period—the development of the historical monograph, of the doctoral dissertation, of the co-operative history, and the tendency toward economic and impersonal history.

In the same session, Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, of Harvard University, gave a description, both interesting and instructive, of the Psychology of a Constitutional Convention, based on his recent experiences as a member of the constitutional convention of Massachusetts.

Students of Latin-American history, gathered in a special conference, had an opportunity of hearing five papers, most of which are likely to be printed later in the new journal of that specialty. An important and original paper, bridging the history of Spain and of Spanish America, was that in which Dr. Charles H. Cunningham, of the University of Texas, exhibited the Institutional Background of Latin American History, by showing how the institutions which Spain set up for the administration of her colonial empire were readily derived by adaptation from institutions which she had already been called upon to develop. The progress of southward conquest by the Spanish kingdoms in the Middle Ages required them to originate a system of royal and municipal officials, executive and judicial—adelantados, alcaldes, corregidores, audiencias, and councils—which were obvious models for viceroys and provisional governors, municipal organizations, and audiencias in the New World.

Dr. Charles W. Hackett of the University of California defined with precision, but in a manner impossible to summarize, the history of the Delimitation of Political Jurisdictions in Spanish North America, established prior to 1535, indicating the successive changes

<sup>8</sup> The papers of Dr. Clark and Professor Fish will be printed before long in the *Military Economist and Historian*.

in those jurisdictions, and sketching the political readjustments resulting from those changes.<sup>9</sup>

The history of Portuguese America received equal attention with that of Spanish America. Professor William R. Manning, of the University of Texas, narrated the story of an Early Diplomatic Controversy between the United States and Brazil, namely that which Condé Raguet, American chargé d'affaires in Brazil from 1824 to 1827, waged with the Brazilian authorities over the blockade maintained by Brazil before Argentine ports, during the war over the question of Uruguay. Professor Percy A. Martin, of Leland Stanford University, showed the Influence of the United States on the Opening of the Amazon to the World's Commerce, beginning with the unsuccessful efforts made in 1850 and with Lieutenant M. F. Maury's somewhat truculent memorial of 1853, and described the effects of those efforts and of the work of Tavares Bastos who finally persuaded the Emperor Don Pedro II., in 1866, to sign the imperial decree opening the Brazilian portion of the Amazon to international commerce. Mr. Reginald Orcutt, of Washington, ended the session with a Review of the History of German Colonization in Brazil, from 1827 to 1914.

For those whose interest lies in the field of Far Eastern history, there was a profitable session on the last day of the convention, in which four papers, concerning the recent history of China and Japan and the relations of America to them, were read by Professors F. W. Williams of Yale University, Kenneth S. Latourette of Denison University, W. W. McLaren of Williams College, and the Rev. Dr. Sidney L. Gulick of New York, respectively. The first spoke of the Mid-Victorian Attitude of Foreigners in China. He described the ignorance of social and material conditions in the Chinese Empire on the part of the Europeans who gathered in the five ports thrown open to maritime commerce in 1842 by the Opium War, the economic and other sources of irritation, and the effects of the policy which Lord Palmerston followed in Europe in dealing with other powers, and of the extension of that policy to China, in the form of truculence and high-handed imposition, until, after another war, more conciliatory and educational methods of intercourse were proposed by Anson Burlingame, American minister to China, and inaugurator of the first plan for an open-door policy.

Mr. Latourette reviewed in detail the whole development of American Scholarship in Chinese History, lamenting the scantiness

<sup>9</sup> The papers of Dr. Cunningham and Dr. Hackett appear in the first number of the *Hispanic American Historical Review*.

of American contributions to that study, in contrast to the excellent work of European scholars, especially French and English, and expressing the earnest desire, which indeed all should share, that the subject should attract more attention in this country. Mr. McLaren's topic was Twenty Years of Party Politics in Japan, 1897-1917, Dr. Gulick's, the History of Naturalization Legislation in the United States, with special reference to Chinese and Japanese Immigration, his main historical thesis being that it is only since 1907 that the Act of 1875 has been uniformly interpreted by the courts as excluding Japanese from naturalization.

In the business meeting of the Association, which took place on the last afternoon of the sessions, the prevailing note was of adjustment to pecuniary limitations caused by the war. The many subscriptions which are called for from the class of persons chiefly represented in the Association have caused an unusual number of members to resign from it or to omit to pay their annual dues, and a serious diminution of revenue is already visible, while the efforts to increase endowment, hopefully undertaken at the beginning of 1917, have been nearly discontinued since the entrance of the United States into the war. The feeling has been that success was not to be expected in times so unpropitious. Yet it is impossible to remain permanently content with anything short of a large increase in the Association's scientific activities, for it is impossible not to feel with great earnestness the increased responsibility of America for maintaining the apparatus of the world's civilization. In every European country the sources from which scientific undertakings have been sustained will have been dried up or almost fatally diminished by the war. A recent German educational article sets forth, in plaintive accents, with many statistics, and with much truth, that "our superiority, anchored in the popular education of Germany and in the standard of our culture", will be impaired, that Germany's intellectual development "would be reduced to a wretched condition if Germany were to lose this war, or even if it were to be obliged to conclude a peace of renunciation". In any probable event of the war, America will emerge from it less damaged than any other combatant. When this shattered world resumes with pathetic courage the work of advancing civilization, it were shameful for America not to assume the chief part, if not in the labors of scholarship themselves, at any rate in their sustainment. Hers should be, in all departments of knowledge, the chief funds for the endowment of research.

At the moment, however, the American Historical Association



had nothing before it but to pursue a prudent course. The report of the secretary, Mr. Leland, showed an actual membership of 2654, less by 85 than was reported a year before. That of the treasurer, Dr. Bowen, of which a summary is presented at the end of this article, indicated net receipts, for the year, of \$8659, net expenditures of \$9454, a deficit of \$795. The assets were reported as \$28,516. They would have been less than those of the year preceding by the amount of the deficit mentioned, and by a decline of \$200 in the value of certain securities, but these losses had been more than counterbalanced by the payments made into the general endowment fund, for which it was reported that subscriptions amounting to \$3365 had been made, and \$1490 had been paid in.

The secretary of the Council, Professor Greene, reported its transactions, as required by the constitution, and a number of recommendations, all of which were adopted by the Association.<sup>10</sup> Dr. Bowen, who had been the treasurer of the Association throughout the whole thirty-three years of its existence, having retired from that office, the secretary of the Council reported resolutions by which that body endeavored to express its sense of the society's indebtedness to Dr. Bowen for this long period of unselfish and efficient labor, and the Association with much warmth of feeling passed resolutions of similar tenor. The secretary of the Council also reported on the work of various committees, and also on the budget<sup>11</sup> and the necessary omission of appropriations to several of these committees. Mr. Shearer reported the results of the conference of historical societies, Professor Herbert E. Bolton, informally, on the latest meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch. Professor Edward P. Cheyney, chairman of the Board of Editors of this review, reported on its transactions and on the policy which it has adopted during war-time, and the Association took the final steps in adjusting the financial relations between the Board and the Association.<sup>12</sup> The committee on the Adams Prize, unable to report at the time of the business meeting, has since reported an award of the prize to Lieut. F. L. Nussbaum of the National Army, for an essay entitled "G. J. A. Ducher: an Essay in the Political History of Mercantilism during the French Revolution."

Upon recommendation by the Council, the conditions of award

<sup>10</sup> The principal votes passed by the Council at the session held by it in New York on December 1, 1917, and at those sessions which it held in Philadelphia, December 26-29, are printed in an appendix to this article, and the principal votes passed by the Association in another.

<sup>11</sup> Printed in an appendix, as adopted by the Association.

<sup>12</sup> See below, pp. 524-525.

of the two prizes were so modified as to provide that the field of the Winsor Prize shall be American history, that of the Adams prize the history of the Eastern Hemisphere; that printed monographs as well as manuscript may be submitted and considered; and that a manuscript to which a prize has been awarded may be printed in the *Annual Reports*, publication in separate volumes being discontinued after the present year.<sup>13</sup>

The report of the Committee on Nominations was presented by its chairman, Professor Frank M. Anderson, of Dartmouth College. In accordance with its recommendations, Mr. William R. Thayer, first vice-president of the Association, was elected president, Professor Edward Channing first vice-president, Mr. J. J. Jusserand, ambassador of France, second vice-president. Mr. Waldo G. Leland, Professor Evarts B. Greene, and Mr. A. Howard Clark were re-elected to their respective offices of secretary, secretary of the Council, and curator. Mr. Charles Moore of Detroit, president of the United States Fine Arts Commission, was elected treasurer. The new members chosen to the Council were Professors William E. Dodd, of the University of Chicago, Walter L. Fleming, of Vanderbilt University, and William E. Lingelbach, of the University of Pennsylvania. The full list of officers, of members of the Council, and of committees, appears on a later page. The Council elected Professor Charles H. Haskins, of Harvard, a member of the Board of Editors of the *American Historical Review* for the period of six years from the adjournment of the meeting, in succession to Professor Ephraim Emerton, whose term then expired.

#### PRINCIPAL VOTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL<sup>14</sup>

DECEMBER 1, 1917

*Voted*, That a committee of five be appointed by the chair to prepare for an appropriate representation of the American Historical Association at the International Congress of the History of America to be held at Rio de Janeiro in September, 1922.

*Voted*, To recommend to the Association the following plan for the administration of the funds of the *American Historical Review*:

1. That the Treasurer of the American Historical Association be requested to institute a separate fund called the American Historical

<sup>13</sup> Copies of the revised rules may be obtained from the secretary of the Association.

<sup>14</sup> A pamphlet of 12 pages, containing statistics of membership, the treasurer's annual statement, and, in full, the minutes of the meetings of the Executive Council held at Cincinnati on December 29, 1916, and at New York December 1, 1917, was distributed at the time of the Philadelphia meeting, and may be obtained from the secretary of the Association.

Review Fund, to be used only for purposes of the *Review*, consisting at its inception of the balance now possessed by the Board of Editors, and now transferred by it to the treasury of the Association.

2. That the Macmillan Company's monthly payments of \$200, and any payments of profits by that firm under their contract, be hereafter paid to the treasurer of the Association and by him placed to the credit of the American Historical Review Fund;

3. That in order to meet the payments which the treasurer has to make to the Macmillan Company for numbers of the *Review* sent to members at 40 cents each, the Council of the Association at each annual meeting appropriate to the American Historical Review Fund a sum sufficient to cover a payment of \$1.60 for each of the estimated number of members to receive the *Review* during that year, such estimate to be certified by the secretary of the Association.

4. That all such payments as have heretofore been made by the treasurer of the Board of Editors be hereafter made by the treasurer of the Association on warrant from the managing editor.

*(These recommendations were adopted by the Association.)*

*Voted*, That the usual November meeting of the Council be omitted in 1918.

*Voted*, To recommend to the Association that the terms of award of the Justin Winsor and the Herbert Baxter Adams Prizes be modified so as to provide:

1. That the publication of the prize essays in the present form be discontinued.

2. That competition for the prizes be open to monographs, submitted either in manuscript or after publication, provided that the date of publication has been within two years preceding the award.

3. That the competition be limited to monographs in the English language by writers of the Western Hemisphere who have not previously published any considerable work or won an established reputation.

4. That a monograph to which a prize has been awarded in manuscript may, if deemed in all respects available, be published in the *Annual Report* of the Association.

5. That the modified system of competition go into effect for the Winsor Prize in 1918, and the Adams Prize in 1919.

*(These recommendations were adopted by the Association.)*

*Voted*, That the secretary of the Association and the secretary of the Council be a special committee on membership.

DECEMBER 26-29, 1917

*Voted*, on recommendation from the Advisory Board of the *History Teacher's Magazine*, that the number of issues of that journal be reduced from ten to nine.

*Voted*, That the treasurer be instructed to send a bill for the October number of the *American Historical Review*<sup>15</sup> to members whose dues remain unpaid on the first of June.

<sup>15</sup> Sent before it can be known whether the member intends to pay the bill sent by the treasurer of the Association on September 1.

*Voted*, That in view of the present financial situation the Board of Editors of the *American Historical Review* be requested to consider ways and means of reducing the expenses of publication of the *Review*.

*Voted*, That the Board of Editors of the *American Historical Review* be authorized to negotiate with the Macmillan Company respecting the price at which the *Review* is furnished to members of the Association, with the understanding (1) that the price per number be forty cents as at present,<sup>16</sup> (2) that the Association guarantee the publishers against deficit on account of the publication of the *Review* in 1918, to an amount not exceeding ten cents for each copy furnished to members of the Association.

*Voted*, To appoint a special Council Committee, of five members, on Policy, with instructions to report to the Council at its next meeting respecting the future scientific activities of the Association.

*Voted*, To recommend to the Association, 1. That the next annual meeting be held in Minneapolis; provided however, that if, in view of the emergency due to the state of war, there appears to the Executive Council to be sufficient reason for changing the place of meeting or omitting the meeting altogether, the Executive Council be authorized to take such action and directed to notify the Association of its decision not later than September 1;

2. That if the annual meeting of 1918 is omitted the officers of the Association shall continue in office until the next annual meeting of the Association;

3. That, except in respect to the adoption of the annual budget, the secretary of the Council be authorized to take the votes of the Council by mail, when, in the judgment of the president and the secretary, such a procedure is expedient.

*(These recommendations were adopted by the Association.)*

#### PRINCIPAL VOTES OF THE ASSOCIATION<sup>17</sup>

*Voted*, That By-law no. 2<sup>18</sup> be amended as follows: In the second sentence change the words "first of October" to "fifteenth of September"; in the third sentence change the words "twenty days" to "one month"; insert the word "business" before the word "meeting" wherever it occurs in the by-law; in the fourth sentence change the words "five days" to "one day" and add at the end of the sentence the words "but such nominations by petition shall not be presented until after the Committee on Nominations shall have reported its nominations to the Association as provided for in the present by-law".

The following resolution, laid before the Association, was referred by it to the Council with power to act, and was subsequently adopted by the Council:

In view of the large educational, humanitarian, and missionary interests which American organizations have long maintained within the limits of the Ottoman Empire,

<sup>16</sup> The contract price is 50 cents, but the publishers some years ago agreed to reduce it to 40 cents on certain conditions.

<sup>17</sup> Additional to the votes approving recommendations of the Council, as indicated in the memorandum preceding.

<sup>18</sup> See *American Historical Review*, XXI. 464-465.

*Resolved*, That the American Historical Association empower its president to appoint a committee of three to urge upon the government of the United States the importance of adequately safeguarding, during the course of any peace negotiations, the future rights and activities of American educational and scientific enterprises in the Ottoman Empire, having in mind especially:

General education for men and women; professional education, including medical schools and hospitals; training in agriculture, forestry, engineering, transportation and road-making, economic geology, and mining; geological and geographical explorations, scientific surveys, archaeological excavations, and the legitimate interests of American museums.

It is also recommended that a further function of this committee be to provide for the collection and presentation of all available information which would aid the representatives of the United States in securing the ends suggested in the above resolution.

## SUMMARY OF TREASURER'S REPORT

## RECEIPTS

Balance on hand, December 19, 1916.....	\$ 3,219.64
Receipts to date:	
Annual dues .....	\$6,834.59
Life membership dues .....	50.00
Dividends on bank stock .....	240.00
Interest on bond and mortgage.....	900.00
Loan, Clarence W. Bowen .....	1,642.00
Sales of publications .....	407.96
Royalties .....	134.27
Gift for London Headquarters .....	50.00
Miscellaneous .....	42.40
	<u>10,301.22</u>
	<u>\$13,520.86</u>

## DISBURSEMENTS

Office of secretary and treasurer .....	\$ 1,572.86
Executive Council, expenses of travel.....	239.04
Office of secretary of the Council.....	36.15
Committee on Nominations .....	77.50
Committee on Programme, 1917 .....	123.39
Conference of Historical Societies .....	53.72
Committee on Publications .....	1,054.49
Editorial services .....	138.55
General Index .....	750.00
<i>American Historical Review</i> .....	4,261.20
Historical Manuscripts Commission .....	6.70
Public Archives Commission .....	82.70
Committee on Membership .....	10.00
Committee on Bibliography .....	5.00
Adams Prize .....	125.00
<i>Writings on American History</i> .....	200.00
<i>History Teacher's Magazine</i> .....	200.00
Special Committee on Finance .....	50.00
London Headquarters .....	150.00

Payment of loan .....	1,642.00
Bills payable December 19, 1916 .....	318.21
Total disbursements .....	<u>\$11,096.51</u>
Balance on hand, December 19, 1917.....	2,424.35
	<u>\$13,520.86</u>

BUDGET FOR 1918<sup>19</sup>

## APPROPRIATIONS

Offices of secretary and treasurer.....	\$2,000
Committee on Nominations .....	75
Pacific Coast Branch .....	50
Programme Committee .....	150
Conference of Historical Societies .....	25
Committee on Publications .....	1,000
Editorial services .....	150
General Index .....	250
<i>American Historical Review</i> .....	5,000
Historical Manuscripts Commission <sup>20</sup> .....	150
Winsor Prize Committee .....	200
London Headquarters <sup>20</sup> .....	150
Military History Prize <sup>20</sup> .....	250
Committee on Bibliography of Modern English History <sup>20</sup> .....	125
Bills payable .....	29
	<u>\$9,604</u>

## ESTIMATED INCOME

Annual dues .....	\$7,050
Life members' fees .....	100
Publications .....	400
Royalties .....	125
Investments .....	1,100
Gifts .....	100
Registration fees, annual meeting .....	150
	<u>\$9,025</u>

## OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

*President*, William R. Thayer, Cambridge.

*First Vice-President*, Edward Channing, Cambridge.

*Second Vice-President*, Jean Jules Jusserand, Washington.

*Secretary*, Waldo G. Leland, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington.

*Treasurer*, Charles Moore, Detroit.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Adopted by the Council on the understanding that subscriptions were to be asked for, to make up the deficiency. By the efforts of Dr. Bowen, subscriptions aggregating \$1336 have been obtained (apart from subscriptions to the general endowment fund), sufficient not only to provide against any probable deficiency in 1918 but also to cover most of the deficit of 1917.

<sup>20</sup> Trust funds.

<sup>21</sup> For purposes of routine business, the treasurer should be addressed at 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; his personal address is 197 Parker Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

*Secretary of the Council*, Evarts B. Greene, Urbana, Ill.<sup>22</sup>

*Curator*, A. Howard Clark, Smithsonian Institution.

*Executive Council* (in addition to the above-named officers):

Andrew D. White, <sup>23</sup>	Andrew C. McLaughlin,
James Schouler,	H. Morse Stephens,
James Ford Rhodes,	George L. Burr,
John B. McMaster,	Worthington C. Ford, <sup>23</sup>
Simeon E. Baldwin,	Herbert E. Bolton,
J. Franklin Jameson,	Henry E. Bourne,
George B. Adams,	William E. Dodd,
Albert Bushnell Hart,	Walter L. Fleming,
Frederick J. Turner,	Samuel B. Harding,
William M. Sloane,	William E. Lingelbach,
Theodore Roosevelt,	Lucy M. Salmon,
William A. Dunning,	George M. Wrong.

*Committees:*

*Committee on Programme for the Thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting:*<sup>24</sup>

*Committee on Local Arrangements:*<sup>24</sup>

*Committee on Nominations:* Charles H. Ambler, University of West Virginia, chairman; Christopher B. Coleman, Carl R. Fish, J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, Victor H. Paltsits.

*Editors of the American Historical Review:* Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Carl Becker, Charles H. Haskins, J. Franklin Jameson, James H. Robinson, Claude H. Van Tyne.

*Historical Manuscripts Commission:* Justin H. Smith, 270 Beacon St., Boston, chairman; Dice R. Anderson, Mrs. Amos G. Draper, Logan Esarey, Gaillard Hunt, Charles H. Lincoln, Milo M. Quaife.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize:* Frederick L. Paxson, University of Wisconsin, chairman; Edward S. Corwin, Frank H. Hodder, Ida M. Tarbell, Oswald G. Villard.

*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize:* Ruth Putnam, 2035 O St., N. W., Washington, chairman; Charles D. Hazen, Robert H. Lord, Louis J. Paetow, Conyers Read.

*Public Archives Commission:* Victor H. Paltsits, 2240 Grand Concourse, New York, chairman; Eugene C. Barker, Solon J. Buck, John C. Fitzpatrick, George N. Fuller, George S. Godard, Peter Guilday, Thomas M. Owen.

*Committee on Bibliography:* George M. Dutcher, Wesleyan University, Middletown, chairman; Frank A. Golder, Adelaide R. Hasse, William T. Laprade, Albert H. Lybyer, Wallace Notestein, William W. Rockwell, Augustus H. Shearer, Bernard C. Steiner.

<sup>22</sup> Until August, 1917, Professor Greene may best be addressed at 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

<sup>23</sup> Those named in this list from President White to Mr. Ford are ex-presidents.

<sup>24</sup> Selection of these committees was deferred, in view of the vote of the Association respecting a possible postponement, or change of place, of the annual meeting.



*Committee on Publications:* H. Barrett Learned, 2123 Bancroft Place, Washington, chairman; and (*ex officio*) George M. Dutcher, Evarts B. Greene, J. Franklin Jameson, Waldo G. Leland, Victor H. Paltsits, Frederic L. Paxson, Ruth Putnam, Justin H. Smith.

*Committee on History in Schools:* J. Montgomery Gambrill, Teachers College, chairman; Victoria A. Adams, Henry L. Cannon, Herbert D. Foster, Samuel B. Harding, James A. James, Daniel C. Knowlton, August C. Krey, Robert A. Maurer, Nathaniel W. Stephenson, Rolla M. Tryon, William L. Westermann.

*Conference of Historical Societies:* Augustus H. Shearer, Grosvenor Library, Buffalo, secretary.

*Advisory Board of the History Teacher's Magazine:* Henry Johnson, Teachers College, chairman; Fred M. Fling, Margaret McGill, James Sullivan, Anna B. Thompson, Oliver H. Williams.<sup>25</sup>

*Special Committee on Policy:* Charles H. Haskins, Harvard University, chairman; Carl Becker, William E. Dodd, Guy S. Ford, Dana C. Munro.

*Special Committee on the Historical Congress at Rio de Janeiro:* Bernard Moses, University of California, chairman; Julius M. Klein, 1824 Belmont Road, Washington, secretary; Charles L. Chandler, Charles H. Cunningham, Percy A. Martin.

*Special Committee on American Educational and Scientific Enterprises in the Ottoman Empire:* Edward C. Moore, Harvard University, chairman; James H. Breasted, Albert H. Lybyer.

<sup>25</sup> The chairman and Miss McGill were appointed for a term of three years; the other members of this committee hold over.

## THE MIKADO'S RATIFICATION OF THE FOREIGN TREATIES

FROM many points of view the most interesting period in the whole history of Japan lies between 1853 and 1868, between the appearance of Commodore Perry and his black ships in the Bay of Yedo and the restoration of the Mikado as the temporal ruler of Japan. It is the period in which Japan renewed her foreign intercourse, abandoned for more than two hundred years, and came into contact with the maritime countries of Europe and America. It is the period also of the rapid decline and fall of the Shogunate and the concomitant rise of the imperial power. Within a few years the question of foreign intercourse became involved, apparently beyond extrication, with the turbulent domestic politics of the time. This was not understood by the first foreign representatives at the court of the Shogun. They emphasized the importance of foreign rights and foreign relations, but the Japanese were far more concerned with the internal struggle, at times stained with blood, between the Shogunate and the supporters of the imperial house. As long as this interrelation of foreign and domestic affairs continued, there could be little hope of peaceful intercourse, for the lives of foreigners were sacrificed to serve some political end. Fortunately the separation came before the political crisis ended in civil war but it came under circumstances which have been but little understood and the significance of the event has not been properly appreciated, even at the present day.<sup>1</sup> Of all the events in that period of stress and turmoil, none had a greater or more lasting import than the Mikado's sanction of the foreign treaties on the 5th of November, 1865.

The fundamental difficulty lay in the disputed powers of the Shogun. For six and a half centuries the temporal power in Japan had been exercised almost without exception by military leaders, generally holding the office of Shogun. From 1603 until 1867 this office was held by members of the Tokugawa family, beginning with the great general and administrator, Ieyasu. During his lifetime and that of his strong successors there was no question of the power of the Shogunate to determine all administrative matters without

<sup>1</sup> For a more detailed study of the period see Treat, *Early Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Japan, 1853-1865*.

even a reference to the Mikado at Kyoto.<sup>2</sup> The epochal edicts of exclusion and seclusion of 1624, 1636, and 1638, were issued without any reference to the throne; and the later laws governing foreign intercourse, such as the edicts of 1825, 1842, and 1843, were promulgated in the same manner.<sup>3</sup> In this respect the foreigners were right when they believed that the Mikado had relinquished his temporal powers.

It was the Shogunate itself which raised the question of the reserved powers of the Mikado. Unwilling to accept the responsibility for altering the foreign policy of the empire, as proposed by Commodore Perry at his first visit in 1853, it referred the question to the throne and to the feudal lords. The imperial court at Kyoto and a majority of the *daimyos* (feudal lords) favored the maintenance of the exclusion laws, and the former sent down instructions to the Shogun at Yedo to drive the foreigners away.<sup>4</sup> Some defensive measures were taken, but eventually the Shogunate determined to grant the requests of the Americans, and the treaty of March 31, 1854, was signed. In this, and some of the contemporary treaties, the Tycoon (Shogun) is spoken of as the Emperor of Japan. The Perry treaty, and the British and Russian compacts which soon followed, were reported to the Mikado and his approval was granted in February, 1855.<sup>5</sup> Thus the weakness of the Shogunate had established two precedents, that treaties must be referred to the Mikado and approved by him, and that the *daimyos* might claim the right to be consulted about foreign affairs.

During the next few years the smouldering opposition to the Shogunate steadily increased, and its enemies made much of the weakness manifested in the reversal of the wise exclusion policy of the early Tokugawa.<sup>6</sup> Within the Shogun's castle there were divided counsels, a small minority of enlightened officials using all their influence in favor of the maintenance of the new foreign relations. So when Townsend Harris, the first American consul-general, sought to secure a treaty of commerce in place of the earlier treaty of peace and friendship, the liberal leaders had to face a growing opposition. Fortunately Harris conducted himself so well during his fifteen

<sup>2</sup> Gubbins, *Progress of Japan, 1853-1871*, pp. 71, 269; Satoh, *Agitated Japan: the Life of Baron Ii Kamon-no-Kami Naosuke*, p. 5; Akimoto, *Lord Ii Naosuke and New Japan*, p. 113.

<sup>3</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1866, LXXVI. [3615], p. 4; *Senate Ex. Doc.* 59, p. 79, 32 Cong., 1 sess., serial 620.

<sup>4</sup> Gubbins, *Progress of Japan*, p. 92.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 100.

<sup>6</sup> The gradual weakening of the Tokugawa Shogunate in the preceding century cannot be considered here. The process was accelerated with the coming of Commodore Perry and the problems then presented.

months' residence at Shimoda that he won the confidence of the Japanese. That moral victory gained, it was possible for him to secure an audience of the Shogun, and later to convince the enlightened prime minister, Lord Hotta Bitchiu-no-Kami, that Japan's best interests lay in enlarged intercourse with all the great powers.<sup>7</sup> With the negotiation of this master-treaty we are not concerned. But when it was almost agreed upon the Japanese commissioners stated that such was the opposition in the Castle that the treaty would have to be referred to the "Spiritual Emperor" at Kyoto for his approval, and "that the moment that approval was received, the *daimyos* must withdraw their opposition". Harris very naturally inquired what would happen if the Mikado refused his assent and was told "in a prompt and decided manner, that the government had determined not to receive any objections from the Mikado". If this was the case, he then asked, what was the use in delaying the negotiations "for what appears to be a mere ceremony", and he was told "that it was this solemn ceremony that gave value to it".<sup>8</sup> He proposed, therefore, that they complete their work, but postpone signing the treaty until the end of sixty days. This was agreed to, the draft was completed on February 26, 1858, and Harris looked forward to April 21 when it would be signed.

The positive assurance of the Japanese commissioners was justified by all the previous relations between the Shogunate and the imperial court. Never had a request for the formal approval of an act been denied. So two minor officials were sent up to Kyoto to secure the imperial sanction for the treaty, Hayashi Daigaku-no-Kami, who had been one of the signatories of the Perry treaty, and Tsuda Hanzaburo. Hayashi presented to the imperial court a letter from Hotta, the prime minister, but the opponents of the Shogunate saw in the low rank of Hayashi and Tsuda a chance to make trouble and crying out that their presence was an insult to the throne they prevented a favorable reply.<sup>9</sup> This was the first rebuff of the Shogunate.

Lord Hotta, alarmed at the evidence of open hostility in Kyoto, then went up himself to reason with the court. The address which he presented was a remarkable document, the work of a forward-looking statesman, amazingly modern in its point of view for that period.<sup>10</sup> It pointed out the changed conditions in international

<sup>7</sup> For a Japanese record of Harris's arguments see *U. S. For. Rel.*, 1879, pp. 620-636, serial 1902.

<sup>8</sup> Griffis, *Life of Townsend Harris*, p. 288.

<sup>9</sup> Satoh, *Life of Lord Hotta*, pp. 69-71.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 73-79.

affairs, the increasing relations between the world-powers, their mutual dependence, and the impossibility that any country should remain secluded. Hence Japan would either have to establish amicable relations with the powers or engage in a disastrous war. He strongly believed that this was the opportune moment for throwing off the traditional policy three centuries old, and for playing a real part in the affairs of the world. He would open intercourse with foreign countries, encourage reciprocal relations, exchange ministers, encourage shipping, remedy internal weaknesses, develop the national resources, and make military preparations. Believing in a world-state, he felt, as a loyal Japanese, that the Mikado alone was "so noble and illustrious as to command universal vassallage". "To have such a ruler over the whole world is doubtless in conformity with the Will of Heaven." In the meantime, however, he advocated something not unlike the modern "League of Nations".

When our power and national standing have come to be recognized, we should take the lead in punishing the nation which may act contrary to the principle of international interests; and in so doing, we should join hands with the nations whose principles may be found identical with those of our country. An alliance thus formed should also be directed towards protecting harmless but powerless nations. Such a policy could be nothing else but the enforcement of the power and authority deputed (to us) by the Spirit of Heaven. Our national prestige thus ensured, the nations of the world will come to look up to our Emperor as the Great Ruler of all nations, and they will come to follow our policy and submit themselves to our judgment.

It should be remembered, therefore, that at this time the Shogunate advocated foreign intercourse as a sound national policy.

At first Hotta was almost successful, but the hostile court nobles (*kuge*) compelled the *kuambaku* (imperial prime minister) to alter the text of the Mikado's reply, so that it denounced the foreign policy of the Shogunate, and demanded that the opinions of the Three Houses of the Tokugawa family<sup>11</sup> and of the *daimyos* be consulted before again asking for the imperial sanction.<sup>12</sup> Lord Hotta, baffled, returned to Yedo on June 1. Harris, in the meantime, had gone up from Shimoda, ready for the formal signing of the treaty on April 21, only to be told that Hotta had not returned. As he waited week after week, he is said to have threatened to go to Kyoto himself and there negotiate directly with the Mikado.<sup>13</sup> When Hotta finally arrived, Harris was persuaded to agree to a further postponement, until September 4. In the meantime, Lord

<sup>11</sup> The princely houses of Mito, Owari, and Kii.

<sup>12</sup> Satoh, *Life of Lord Hotta*, pp. 84-85.

<sup>13</sup> Griffis, *Life of Townsend Harris*, p. 314.

Ii Kamon-no-Kami, who had been appointed *tairo* or regent, hoped that he might be able to gain the approval of the imperial court.

At this time there was a further complication in the Yedo administration. It arose over the question of the succession to the office of Shogun. The incumbent, Iesada, was dying without an heir. Two claimants were presented, representing two of the Three Houses. We cannot dwell upon this incident, except to note that the action of the Shogun and Lord Ii in designating the young scion of Kii, instead of the more mature son of the former Lord of Mito, embittered the latter noble and his party in the Castle. Men who favored foreign intercourse went into opposition to the administration because of the dispute over the heir, and Nariaki, former lord of Mito, and one of the most influential of the feudal lords, became the open leader of the anti-foreign faction in the Yedo government. Iemochi was designated as heir on July 11, the imperial court approved the appointment, and on August 4 the formal installation was held.

Lord Ii, therefore, had settled the vexed question of the heirship, and he had until September 4 to win the Mikado's approval of the Harris treaty. But on July 23 the United States steamship *Mississippi* arrived at Shimoda with the news of the Tientsin treaties negotiated the month before between China and Russia, the United States, France, and Great Britain. It was thought that the victorious squadrons of the Anglo-French allies would cross over to Japan and demand a liberal commercial treaty. Harris at once started for Yedo to urge that the Japanese sign his treaty, without any compulsion, thus granting peacefully and with honor all that the European powers supported by their guns could demand.

The message which Harris sent to Yedo created a profound sensation in the Castle. A special conference of the higher officials was at once called. A majority favored signing the treaty at once. Lord Ii, the *tairo*, advocated a brief delay until the imperial approval might be obtained. But the majority felt that this was no time for further negotiations at Kyoto, and they finally had their way.<sup>14</sup> Lord Ii instructed the two Japanese commissioners to consult with Harris, urging him to wait a while longer, if possible, but if he deemed it inadvisable, to sign the treaty at once. Harris repeated his reasons why Japan should conclude his treaty before the fleets arrived, Iwase and Inouye accepted them, and the treaty was signed early on the morning of July 29, 1858, on board the U. S. S. *Powhatan*.

This action of Lord Ii, in instructing the commissioners to sign

<sup>14</sup> Akimoto, *Lord Ii Naosuke*, p. 159.

the treaty if it seemed best, furnishes an explanation of many of the events of the next seven years. A treaty had been signed without the imperial approval, and in violation of the imperial instructions. This involved the whole question of foreign affairs in the turmoil of internal politics; it gave a rallying cry to the supporters of the Mikado and the opponents of the Shogunate—"Honor the Emperor and expel the Barbarians"; and it placed the Shogunate at once on the defensive.

Yet there was little else for Lord Ii to do.<sup>15</sup> He believed that the treaty should be signed, and he hoped to the day of his death to secure an *ex post facto* ratification by the Mikado. The tense situation at Yedo must also be recognized. On August 14, the Shogun died, but not until punishments had been meted out to the great lords who had opposed the appointment of Iemochi as heir. The new Shogun entered upon his administration with divided counsels instead of a strong Shogunate organization to oppose the rising influence of the Mikado. In August the Russian and British envoys arrived from Tientsin, as expected. The Dutch agent came up from Nagasaki, and in October the French envoy arrived. With all of them treaties were negotiated, based upon the Harris treaty and with slight modifications. And these treaties also were signed without the Mikado's approval.

It now became necessary for Lord Ii not only to secure the Mikado's sanction for the treaties, but also to curb the open opposition of the anti-Shogunate factions in Yedo and Kyoto. The court, encouraged by the division of counsels in Yedo, had secured an imperial decree ordering the *tairo* or one of the princes of the Three Houses to present himself in Kyoto with an explanation of the foreign situation.<sup>16</sup> Lord Ii could not go himself, and two of the three princes were undergoing domiciliary confinement for their opposition to the designated heir, while the third was a minor. His failure to obey the summons further embittered the hostile party. Finally, in October, he sent up Lord Manabe, of the *roju* (cabinet), to appease the court, and stamp out the opposition there. Soon after his arrival in Kyoto a number of *samurai* and townspeople who had taken part in the hostile propaganda were arrested and sent to Yedo, where they were imprisoned with a number arrested there. These were punished by a special court, some beheaded, and others banished. At Kyoto some of the *kuge* were confined and others

<sup>15</sup> Satoh, *Agitated Japan*, pp. 74, 88-89. Akimoto, *Lord Ii Naosuke*, p. 154.

<sup>16</sup> Satoh, *Agitated Japan*, p. 93.



forced out of office.<sup>17</sup> These strong measures of Lord Ii added fuel to the flames of opposition.

Then Manabe sought the imperial approval of the treaties. It must now be noted that the approval simply had to be gained. The Shogunate was no longer confident of its influence, it could no longer overawe the court. It was forced, therefore, to recede from its former wise position that the exclusion laws should be annulled for the best interests of Japan, and so fell back to the equivocal view that the treaties were but temporary evils which could not be avoided, that the Shogunate did not desire to cultivate friendly relations with the foreign powers, and that as soon as adequate armaments were prepared the barbarians would be expelled.<sup>18</sup> This was a very different argument from that advanced by Lord Hotta only a few months before. It was no easy matter to secure the Mikado's endorsement of even this temporary measure; but finally, after three months of discussion, on February 2, 1859, the imperial answer was delivered. This took the form of approving the resolution of the Shogun, the *tairo*, and the *roju* to keep the barbarians at a distance and eventually restore the old policy of seclusion, and authorized the Shogun to take temporary measures to this end.<sup>19</sup>

This effort to secure the Mikado's approval of the treaties, covering a full year, indicates clearly the weakening of the Shogun's influence and the corresponding increase in the court's prestige. The change was further shown by the elation of the Shogunate at the conditional approval at length gained. Lord Ii, however, fully recognized the inherent weakness of such a sanction and worked strenuously for another year, and until his assassination, to improve the relations between the court and the Castle and thus gain an unqualified endorsement of the Shogun's foreign policy.

The commercial treaties, therefore, had been negotiated without the imperial approval, and the enlarged foreign relations then inaugurated were agreed to be but temporary. Hence the anti-Shogun, anti-foreign factions had ammunition close at hand. With increasing insistence they demanded that the period of temporary intercourse be brought to a close and that the loyal patriots unite to drive the barbarians into the sea. The Shogunate, during the next six years, had to pursue a temporizing policy. Convinced that foreign relations were absolutely necessary and eminently wise, it tried to live up to the treaties on the one hand, and to quiet the dangerous domestic opposition on the other. Hence its position was unenvia-

<sup>17</sup> Satow, *Japan, 1853-1864*, pp. 31-34.

<sup>18</sup> Satow, in *Cambridge Modern History*, XI. 838.

<sup>19</sup> Satow, *Agitated Japan*, pp. 115-116.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—35.

ble. As the opposition became more violent, and the very existence of the Shogunate was in jeopardy, it tried to bring the foreigners to a realization of its problems and to an amelioration of some of the treaty terms which aroused most opposition in the country. But it always hoped that better understanding of the problem would convince the hostile imperial court of the wisdom of foreign relations.

With the opening of the new ports under the liberal terms of the commercial treaties, on July 1, 1859, friction at once developed. There were faults on both sides, but unquestionably the most offense was given by some of the pioneers of commerce and the first seamen to visit the ports. Blood was soon shed. In the next few years there were several attacks upon foreigners and two attacks upon the British legation. These outrages fall into two categories, those committed by the Japanese as reprisals for wrongs done, and those committed for political reasons—either to involve the Shogunate in war with the foreigners or else to destroy some of the hated barbarians whose presence in Japan was deemed a pollution. In the first class should be placed the murder of two Russian seamen on August 25, 1859, of two Dutch sea-captains on February 26, 1860, the second attack on the British legation on June 26, 1862, and the murder of Richardson on September 14. In the first two cases the crimes were probably in revenge for offenses committed by other Europeans, and in the last case, although Richardson had given offense, yet his assassination was in harmony with the anti-foreign views of the Satsuma men who committed it. In the second category we note the murder of the American interpreter, Heusken, on January 14, 1861; the first attack on the British legation, July 5, following; the murder of Lieutenant de Camus on October 14, 1863; and of Major Baldwin and Lieutenant Bird on November 21, 1864. The burning of the unoccupied British legation on February 1, 1863, was certainly a political act, and possibly the burning of the American legation on May 24 was incendiary and not an accident, as the Shogunate always protested.

With the assassination of Lord Ii, the masterful *tairo*, on March 24, 1860, the Shogunate lost its most virile defender. His successors, unable to carry on his policy of suppression of the opposition, soon reversed it and restored to favor those who had been punished, and turned against many of the pro-foreign leaders. But this *volte-face* was deemed weakness and failed to strengthen the declining administration. Early in 1861 the government determined to appease the anti-foreign agitators by securing a postponement of the opening of Yedo, Osaka, Hiogo, and Niigata. This matter was placed before the treaty powers and those in Europe assented in

terms similar to the London Convention of June 6, 1862. The American consent, although the first to be given in principle, was not formally announced until January 28, 1864.<sup>20</sup>

The foreign representatives were now beginning to realize vaguely that the "ecclesiastical emperor" in Kyoto was a more powerful personality than they had been led to believe. On December 13, 1859, Mr. Harris warned the Shogunate officials that if they failed to observe the treaties and a war ensued, the powers would then negotiate directly with the representatives of the Mikado.<sup>21</sup> But Harris always believed that the Mikado had given his consent to the treaties.<sup>22</sup> Mr. Alcock, the British minister, first realized the flaw in the ratification, in June, 1861,<sup>23</sup> but when he asked the ministers for foreign affairs if the Mikado had sanctioned them he understood them to reply in the affirmative.<sup>24</sup> Yet in March, 1862, he recommended to Lord Russell that "the sanction of treaties" be one of the conditions attached to the postponement of the opening of the ports,<sup>25</sup> but Lord Russell doubtless felt that this question should not be raised. And in June, 1862, although the French minister did not believe that the treaties had been ratified, asserting that the Japanese ministers had admitted as much to Alcock and himself, yet the diplomatic corps agreed "to raise no questions which would imply a doubt as to the validity of the treaties".<sup>26</sup> This became the official attitude of the foreign ministers until Mr. Pruyn, the American minister, in 1863 raised the question anew.

With the successive attacks upon the foreigners, the demands for reparation rapidly increased until they reached a maximum after the Richardson murder. The Russians, the first to lose a national, had asked for no money indemnity. Mr. Harris asked for only \$10,000 as a support for Mr. Heusken's widowed mother. For the first attack on the British legation \$10,000 was asked for the two wounded men, but for the second attack £10,000 was demanded, and for the murder of Richardson £100,000 was demanded from the Shogun, and £25,000 and the punishment of the murderer, from the *daimyo* of Satsuma. The size of this demand, the assessment upon Satsuma, a feudal state with whom the British government had no direct rela-

<sup>20</sup> U. S. *For. Rel.*, 1864, III. 484, serial 1218.

<sup>21</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1861, LXVI. [2829], correspondence respecting affairs in Japan, p. 55.

<sup>22</sup> U. S. *For. Rel.*, 1863, II. 1035, serial 1181.

<sup>23</sup> Alcock, *The Capital of the Tycoon*, II. 132.

<sup>24</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1862, LXIV. [2929], correspondence respecting affairs in Japan, p. 31.

<sup>25</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1863, LXXIV. [3079], pp. 15-22.

<sup>26</sup> U. S. *For. Rel.*, 1863, II. 1035, serial 1181.

tions, and the method of collection, made it the most notable of all punitive demands upon a non-European state.

The growth of these demands paralleled the rise of the anti-foreign opposition and furnished arguments against the greedy and insulting foreigners. The maximum demands, in the Richardson case, came, moreover, at a most inopportune time.

The opposition to the Shogunate, using the unpopularity of its foreign policy as an issue, had rapidly increased. Kyoto, formerly neglected by the feudal lords, now teemed with *daimyos* under the leadership of powerful western feudatories, the *daimyo* of Choshu, and the father of the *daimyo* of Satsuma. The result of their agitation was the sending of a mission to Yedo to demand, in the Mikado's name, the closing of Kanagawa (Yokohama)—offering Shimoda again in exchange—and to secure the Shogun's consent to one of three proposals, that he go up to Kyoto to consult with the court concerning the expulsion of the foreigners, that he appoint five of the anti-foreign maritime *daimyos* to act as regents (*tairo*), or that he appoint Hitotsubashi, the recent Mito candidate for the Shogunate, as guardian, and the ex-*daimyo* of Echizen as *tairo*.<sup>27</sup> The Shogun decided to accept the first and last of the three demands. This has been deemed by some to be the beginning of the end of the Shogunate. Never before had a Shogun been ordered to present himself at the Mikado's court. Not since 1634 had a Shogun visited Kyoto, and then Iemitsu paid his respects to the Mikado as an act of grace and not of duty. The Englishman, Richardson, was assassinated by members of the train of the Satsuma chieftain, who had been the escort of the imperial envoy to Yedo.

For almost a year the Shogun put off this humiliating visit to Kyoto, thus increasing the indignation among the hostile courtiers and feudatories. Just when it could be no longer delayed the British demands for reparation for the Richardson murder arrived and were withheld for twenty-three days by Colonel Neale, the chargé, pending the arrival of the British fleet.<sup>28</sup> When the demands were presented, on April 6, the Shogun was on his way to Kyoto.

Thus the crushing British demands played into the hands of the anti-foreign party at the great conference at Kyoto. The enormous amount demanded of the Shogun for the murder of a foreigner who had given, from the Japanese point of view, cause for punishment,

<sup>27</sup> Satow, *Japan, 1853-1864*, p. 58. Satow, *Kinse Shiriaku*, p. 29. In this version no choice is mentioned.

<sup>28</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1864, LXVI. [3242], pp. 35-44.

was considered a grievous insult; and the fine assessed on Satsuma penalized one of the leaders of the pro-Mikado party. The negotiations at Yokohama between the Japanese and the Anglo-French allies, culminating in an offer of military assistance to the Shogunate against the hostile *daimyos*, and the rejection of the offer by the government, cannot be dwelt upon here.<sup>29</sup> At Kyoto the hostile party was in the ascendant. At the first conference between the Mikado and the Shogun the latter accepted the imperial commands to expel the barbarians, using peaceful negotiations if possible, but if this did not succeed then they were to be swept away.<sup>30</sup>

Even after this agreement, the Shogunate officials hoped that they might prolong the negotiations and eventually find some outlet from the *impasse* in which they found themselves. But the opposition very shrewdly refused to trust the Yedo party. It demanded that a specific date be fixed for the expulsion. The Shogun and his advisers tried to avoid such a decision, but on June 5 the issue was joined, and the Mikado fixed the 25th of that month as the date for the expulsion of the barbarians.<sup>31</sup> The Shogun dutifully accepted this decree, knowing full well that it could not be enforced, and fully intending to temporize further if possible. So, at Yokohama, on the morning of June 24, the representative of the Shogun paid over to the British chargé £110,000 in payment of the indemnities for the murder of Richardson and the second attack on the British legation, and shortly afterwards forwarded to the foreign ministers the following communication:

I have the honor to inform your excellency that I have received full powers to act on the subject herein stated.

I have received orders from his Majesty the Tycoon, now residing at Kioto, and who received orders from the Mikado to cause the open ports to be closed and the foreigners (subjects) of the treaty powers to be removed, as our people will have no intercourse with them; hence negotiation on this subject will afterwards take place with your excellency.<sup>32</sup>

This order was the logical outcome of Lord Manabe's equivocal statement early in 1859. The Shogunate had asserted that the foreign relations were only a temporary evil. Now, with the rapid increase in the imperial prestige, the time had come when the Shogunate could be compelled to bring these relations to a close. But the Shogunate knew that it would be madness to attempt to expel the foreigners, especially when at that moment the largest fleet ever

<sup>29</sup> U. S. For. Rel., 1863, II. 1092-1098, serial 1181.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1114-1115.

<sup>31</sup> Satow, *Japan, 1853-1864*, p. 87. *Parl. Papers*, 1864, LXVI. [3242], p. 68.

<sup>32</sup> U. S. For. Rel., 1863, II. 1120, serial 1181.

assembled in Japanese waters lay off Yokohama. So it would continue to temporize.

At this time a constructive suggestion was made by the American minister, Robert H. Pruyn. On June 27 he forwarded to Mr. Seward a despatch in which he proposed that a naval demonstration be made at Osaka for the sole purpose of securing the Mikado's approval of the treaties.<sup>33</sup> He had at last perceived the absolute necessity of this sanction. Unhappily Great Britain refused to support this proposal<sup>34</sup> and the suggestion was not carried out until two years later.

As the Shogunate still controlled the administration, it believed that it could use the designated date as the time for opening negotiations, instead of expelling the foreigners. But one of the anti-Shogunate (and hence anti-foreign) *daimyos* of the west determined to take matters into his own hands, and so on the early morning of June 26, the armed ships at Shimonoseki, at the entrance to the Inland Sea, in the territory of the *daimyo* of Choshu, fired upon the first foreign ship to come within range, the little American ship *Pembroke*.<sup>35</sup>

This opened a new and interesting phase of Japanese foreign relations. In turn, Choshu fired upon a French and a Dutch ship of war, and then foreign shipping avoided the straits. The American minister sent down the *Wyoming* to destroy the offending vessels, and the French admiral later destroyed some of the batteries. For over a year the foreign ministers discussed the situation at Shimonoseki. The straits were closed by Choshu, the Shogun was unable to open them, and Choshu was actually in open rebellion against him. Most of the ministers and their home governments agreed that the opening of the straits was not worth the effort, and Great Britain especially adopted a policy of moderation, after the criticism aroused by the destruction of Kagoshima, the capital of the Satsuma fief, in August, 1863. Choshu also overreached himself and, after attempting to secure control of the Mikado's person, was ordered to retire from Kyoto.

The weakening of the anti-foreign party, after the loss of Choshu's leadership, was at once evidenced by the Shogun's withdrawal of the expulsion edict in November, 1863, although he still wished to discuss the closing of the port of Kanagawa. But Sir Rutherford Alcock, the British minister, who returned to his post in March, 1864, took the position that the only safety for foreigners and their

<sup>33</sup> U. S. *For. Rel.*, 1863, II. 1125, serial 1181.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 420, lviii-lx, serial 1180.

<sup>35</sup> U. S. *For. Rel.*, 1863, II. 1129-1137, serial 1181.

interests in Japan lay in the support of the Shogunate, that the court and most of the *daimyos* were hostile to foreigners, and that an example should be made of some of the trouble-making feudatories. As Choshu had given cause for punishment, and was still closing the straits, he believed that the blow should fall there.<sup>36</sup> Thus it was that an allied expedition was organized ostensibly to open the straits, but really to crush the leader of the anti-foreign party. Before it finally sailed from Yokohama, the aggressive conduct of Choshu had lost him his influence with the imperial court and he was actually an outlaw, with the Shogun instructed by the Mikado to carry out measures of reprisal. So the allied fleet, comprising British, French, and Dutch ships of war and a chartered American steamer, which sailed against Choshu (despite strict orders from the home governments—which arrived too late)<sup>37</sup> was sent to destroy an outlaw prince instead of the masterful leader of the pro-Mikado, anti-Shogun forces.

The batteries at Shimonoseki were destroyed in September, 1864. Choshu was humbled, and begged for mercy, promising to pay an indemnity to cover the damage he had done, the cost of the allied expedition, and a ransom for the town of Shimonoseki, which might have been destroyed. At Yedo there was suppressed rejoicing. The Shogunate, which had approved of the allied expedition, rejoiced that the Europeans had made the way easy for its own punitive expedition against Choshu, but it regretted that a Japanese *daimyo* had made so poor a showing against the foreigners. Moreover, it did not intend to permit direct intercourse between Choshu, a feudal fief, and the treaty powers. In the negotiations which took place at Yedo and Yokohama and which resulted in the convention of October 22, one of the first points to be raised by the foreign representatives was that the Shogun should secure the Mikado's sanction of the treaties, and a promise was given that every effort would be made to secure this ratification.<sup>38</sup> But this point was not touched upon in the convention, that document being solely concerned with determining the amount to be paid by the Shogun, instead of by Choshu, for indemnities, ransom, or expenses. This sum was fixed at \$3,000,000, and instead of paying part or all of it the Shogun might offer to open Shimonoseki or some other eligible port in the Inland Sea.

Like so many other conventions, that of October 22, 1864, created

<sup>36</sup> See his despatches in *Parl. Papers*, 1865, LVII. [3428].

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 45, 56, 57. *U. S. For. Rel.*, 1864, III. 594, serial 1218.

<sup>38</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1865, LVII. [3428], pp. 122-125, 129-130. *U. S. For. Rel.*, 1864, III. 559-560, 567-575, serial 1218.



more difficulties than it settled. The British and American ministers hoped that the Shogun would open a new port in lieu of paying the heavy indemnity, for they were more interested in the development of commerce than in the exaction of a money fine.<sup>39</sup> The Dutch consul-general agreed with them in part but the French minister and his government believed that the money was more to be desired than a prospective improvement in trade. However, as the plans for confiscating some or all of the Choshu territory had fallen through, because of the opposition of other western lords, the Shogunate decided that it would be better to pay the indemnity than to open a port in territory which it did not own. In announcing this decision, on April 5, 1865, it requested the postponement of the second installment of the indemnity.<sup>40</sup> This request left the door open for argument. The British chargé suggested that a proposal be made to reduce the indemnity in return for opening Hiogo at once, instead of in 1868, and a downward revision of the tariff.<sup>41</sup> On April 25, he developed this idea in a despatch to Earl Russell, this time suggesting that, in addition to the two concessions already mentioned, the written adhesion of the Mikado to the treaties be included, and the three be accepted as equivalent to one-half or two-thirds of the indemnity.<sup>42</sup> This proposal won the approval of Earl Russell and he at once undertook to gain the consent of the other treaty powers.

With the United States he had no difficulty; Holland, while preferring the indemnity, was ready to agree to the British proposal if the other powers would do so; but France flatly refused, asserting "that money was a substantial penalty which once received could not be recalled, whereas permission to trade at Shimonasaki might be rescinded at any moment", and later that the powers had no choice in the matter so long as Japan was willing to pay the indemnity.<sup>43</sup>

But the joint action which Lord Russell could not bring about was finally accomplished by the forceful British representative in Japan. On July 18 Sir Harry Parkes arrived in Yokohama, as the successor of Sir Rutherford Alcock, who had been recalled actually but not ostensibly for violation of instructions in the Shimonoseki

<sup>39</sup> U. S. *For. Rel.*, 1864, III. 582, serial 1218. *Parl. Papers*, 1865, LVII. [3428], p. 137.

<sup>40</sup> U. S. *For. Rel.*, 1865, III. 247, serial 1246.

<sup>41</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1866, LXXVI. [3615], p. 15.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1, 29, 30, 31, 48.

affair.<sup>44</sup> Late in October he received a despatch from Lord Russell, penned on August 23, which instructed him "to ascertain the real state of affairs" in Japan, in conjunction with his colleagues and in communication with the *roju*. This despatch really called for an investigation and a report, but it also pointed out the views of the British Foreign Office. A man of less initiative and assurance would doubtless have followed the letter of his instructions, but Parkes intended to carry out their spirit as well. Wrongly interpreting a statement in one of Russell's despatches to mean that the French foreign minister had agreed that the four representatives in Japan should decide as to whether the three conditions should be accepted as a substitute for two-thirds of the indemnity, he at once summoned his colleagues to a conference.<sup>45</sup> As a matter of fact M. Drouyn de Lhuys had only suggested that the four representatives should decide whether the Shogun should be permitted to postpone the payment of the indemnity installments.<sup>46</sup> On October 26 Parkes easily convinced the French and Dutch representatives of the wisdom of the British proposals. He had the more satisfaction in winning over the former, because M. Roches had specific instructions to insist upon the payment of the indemnity. A memorandum was then agreed upon to the effect that it would be expedient for the representatives to proceed to Osaka and negotiate there with the Tycoon and four of the *roju* who were then at Kyoto engaged in the preparation of the second punitive expedition against Choshu. A long preamble was prefixed to this decision with the object of reconciling the divergent instructions of the four representatives.<sup>47</sup> When Mr. Portman, the American chargé, arrived from Yedo on the 30th he promptly signed the memorandum.

This was the second joint naval demonstration to be organized by the foreign diplomats in Japan, and once more they acted contrary to their specific instructions. Although ostensibly a peaceful undertaking, the fleet was a powerful one. The British furnished five vessels, the French three, the Dutch one, and as there was no American ship-of-war available Mr. Portman was invited to join the British frigate *Pelorus*. The squadron arrived off Hiogo on November 4. The next day letters were sent ashore from the foreign representatives to the Japanese ministers announcing their arrival for the purpose of determining "certain questions of grave importance arising out of the Convention of October 22, 1864".

<sup>44</sup> Lane-Poole, *Life of Sir Harry Parkes*, I. 478.

<sup>45</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1866, LXXVI. [3615], p. 63.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30.

<sup>47</sup> U. S. *For. Rel.*, 1865, III. 266-267, serial 1246.

In his letter Sir Harry Parkes stated that he and his colleagues would demand "a prompt and satisfactory settlement of the questions referred to", and emphasized the importance of securing the formal approval of the treaties by the Mikado, while he closed with the suggestive statement that he was accompanied by Admiral King, commander-in-chief of all the naval forces of Her Britannic Majesty in China and Japan, and that his letter was dated from the admiral's flag-ship.<sup>48</sup>

Of course there were no "questions of grave importance" arising out of the Convention of 1864. The Japanese had paid the first installment of the indemnity almost a year before it was due, and they had asked for a delay of a few months in making the second payment. But this request was used as a lever for forcing certain concessions which the treaty powers desired. And the pressure was applied at a most opportune time, for Japan was threatened with civil war because of the Choshu complications.

In a conference between Abe Bungo-no-Kami and the foreign representatives, on the 11th, it was pointed out that the opening of Hiogo and Osaka had been postponed only on certain conditions as set forth in the London Protocol of 1862, that the conditions had not been kept by Japan, and that hence Great Britain could insist upon the immediate opening of the port and city.<sup>49</sup> Also, the powers would insist upon the punctual payment of the indemnity. Therefore it would be better for the Shogun to grant the three demands of the powers—that Hiogo and Osaka be immediately opened, that the formal consent of the Mikado to the treaties be obtained, that the tariff be reduced to a five per cent. basis—in return for the remission of two-thirds of the indemnity.<sup>50</sup>

Lord Abe agreed that the Shogun had not been able to carry out the conditions of the London Protocol, but explained the difficulties under which he labored and craved the indulgence of the powers. He also maintained that the opening of Hiogo and Osaka was out of the question at the present time, whereupon the ministers replied that if the Shogun would not open Hiogo then the powers might insist upon it under the treaties of 1858, and it was even suggested that there was nothing in the treaties to prevent them from opening trade with the *daimyos* at their own ports. This was an indefensible position, taken to frighten the Shogunate into submis-

<sup>48</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1866, LXXVI. [3615], p. 78.

<sup>49</sup> The representatives had no instructions to raise this point. Russell had proposed it to the powers in July 12, 1865, but no agreement was reached. *Parl. Papers*, 1866, LXXVI. [3615], p. 21.

<sup>50</sup> *U. S. For. Rel.*, 1865, III. 268-272, serial 1246.

sion, for nothing would be more dangerous at this time than for the foreigners to supply munitions and armaments directly to Choshiu and other western *daimyos*.

On the 14th a second interview took place, in which two lesser officials announced that the Tycoon agreed to the justice of the representatives' demands, especially as to the ratification of the treaties, but that it would take time to convince the Mikado, and that a delay of fifteen days should be granted. In reply the representatives said that at most they would wait for eight or ten days, and in order to hasten the decision of the Shogun they added that in the interval they might visit Shimonoseki or other places in the Inland Sea, which they knew the Shogun would be most anxious to prevent.<sup>51</sup>

In Kyoto there was great excitement. The leading Shogunate officials urged the court to ratify the treaties, lest war between Japan and the allied powers ensue.<sup>52</sup> But the conservatives were not easily convinced. This proceeding would rob them of their mightiest weapon against the Shogunate. On the 19th Lord Abe and Lord Matsumai were dismissed from the *roju* on orders from the Mikado. This news reached the representatives, and they were convinced that a conservative reaction had set in at Kyoto. So they sent identic notes to the Tycoon, which were delivered in Kyoto on the 23d, to the effect that if a categorical reply to the proposals were not made in writing within the allotted ten days, which would expire on the 24th, they would consider "that its absence denotes a formal refusal of our conditions on your Majesty's part, and we shall, in that case, be free to act as we may judge convenient".<sup>53</sup>

This scarcely veiled threat produced an immediate effect. On the afternoon of the 24th a member of the *roju*, and other Japanese officials, came aboard the flag-ship to announce that the Mikado had ratified the treaties, that the Tycoon had agreed to the downward revision of the tariff, but that instead of opening Hiogo and Osaka, the Tycoon would pay the full amount of the Shimonoseki indemnity.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>51</sup> U. S. *For. Rel.*, 1865, III. 272-274, serial 1246.

<sup>52</sup> Note the Shogun's memorial to the Mikado, in Adams, *History of Japan*, II. 24-27.

<sup>53</sup> *Parl. Papers*, 1866, LXXVI. [3615], pp. 82-85.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 86.

The above survey of the effort to secure the Mikado's ratification of the treaties indicates how carelessly Captain Brinkley has treated this question in his excellent *History of the Japanese People*, p. 675. "While things were at this stage, Sir Harry Parkes, representative of Great Britain, arrived upon the scene in the Far East. A man of remarkably luminous judgment and military methods,

The Osaka demonstration won for the powers two of their three demands without their yielding a penny of the indemnity. The refusal to open Hiogo and Osaka was a small loss, for these cities would be opened in any case on January 1, 1868. The tariff was revised by the Yedo Convention of June 25, 1866, and remained in force until the treaties of 1894, in spite of all the Japanese efforts for revision after 1872. But the most important of the concessions was the Mikado's ratification of the treaties. It was a great pity that this fundamental act was coupled with a tariff revision for the benefit of the commercial powers.

With the Mikado's sanction of the treaties of 1858-1861, it no longer became the patriotic duty of loyal Japanese to strive for the expulsion and extermination of the foreigners. For the first time in seven years, foreign affairs were divorced from domestic politics. On the one hand, all Japanese were free to take advantage of the material and moral contributions of the West, and on the other the treaty powers were freed from a dangerous dependence upon the Shogunate. Up to this time, as Alcock so often pointed out, the Shogun was the strong support of the treaties, and with his power their maintenance was inextricably involved. But with the Mikado's sanction, the foreign treaties had behind them the rapidly increasing prestige of the Emperor. Hence the supporters of the imperial house realized, as Satsuma had realized in 1863 and Choshiu in 1864, that it was eminently advisable to be pro-Mikado and pro-foreign at the same time, to use foreign materials to beat down the Shogunate, whereas up to this time the Shogunate had largely profited through foreign intercourse. This good understanding with the imperial court made it easy, in 1868, when the Shogun had resigned, and civil war broke out, for the treaty powers to open direct relations with the restored Mikado. If the ratification had not taken place in 1865, or at some time before the civil war, it is quite possible to believe that some, if not all of the treaty powers, would have at once gone to the aid of the Shogunate forces—as the French minister actually proposed—and thus become involved in a terrible civil war between the supporters of the Mikado and those of the Shogun. As it was, a measure of suspicion lingered for some years,

this distinguished diplomatist appreciated almost immediately that the ratification of the treaties by the sovereign was essential to their validity, and that by investing the ratification with all possible formality, the Emperor's recovery of administrative power might be accelerated. He therefore conceived the idea of repairing to Hyogo with a powerful naval squadron for the purpose", etc. As a matter of fact, Parkes merely carried out what Mr. Pruyn and Mr. Winchester had proposed.

the imperialists suspecting the powers which had been so closely associated with the Shogunate, and some of the powers believing that the new imperial government might be anti-foreign as the old Kyoto court had been.

From every point of view, therefore, the ratification of the treaties of 1858 by the Mikado becomes a subject well worth careful study. Every event in the relations between Japan and the foreign powers from 1858 until 1865 was affected by this question. Once it is understood and appreciated, much that seemed unintelligible to the diplomats of that troubled period now seems measurably clear.

PAYSON J. TREAT.

## THE COMMITTEE ON THE CONDUCT OF THE CIVIL WAR<sup>1</sup>

To what extent, with due regard to the public welfare, may the unprofessional civilian control military policy and decide questions of strategy and tactics? The question is surcharged with possibilities of controversy; yet it is a vital one when a democracy, and particularly the American democracy, determines how it will conduct a great war. In the time of the Civil War, there was created a joint committee of Congress on the conduct of that war, which sought and secured a share in the performance of the important functions mentioned in the query—functions commonly associated with the executive department of the government. The results and lessons of the experiment may have contemporaneous interest and importance.

The committee was primarily an investigative body, and as such, it was not without precedent in American history. Such a committee was established in 1791 to investigate the expedition of General St. Clair against the Indians of the Northwest, which had resulted in disaster.<sup>2</sup> Despite a prejudice against St. Clair, the reports exonerated him, after two investigations, but, possibly on account of that prejudice, they were not published. A Committee on the Conduct of the War was proposed by Bradley, of Vermont, in 1813, to "inquire into the multiplied failures of the arms of the United States". The House of Representatives declined to appoint the committee at that time, because the session of Congress was drawing to a close, but in the next session the resolution in modified form was adopted and a committee created to make the inquiry.<sup>3</sup> Although these earlier committees had less scope and less influence than that established in 1861, they served as precedents for it, and were mentioned as such.

In 1861 the United States was unprepared for war. It lacked

<sup>1</sup> Much of the material contained in this article was collected some years ago when I was a graduate student at Columbia University, my purpose being then, as it is still, to publish a history of the committee in book form. The subject was originally suggested by Professor W. A. Dunning, to whom I am indebted for many suggestions.

<sup>2</sup> *Annals of Congress*, 2 Cong., 1792, pp. 490-493, 602, 877, 895.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 13 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 413-421. The debates were similar to that of the Senate in 1861.



trained soldiers; it had no officers experienced in the control and management of large forces in the field; and, perhaps still worse, public opinion was ignorant of military science, rather contemptuous of it in fact, yet demanded an influence in the formation and execution of military plans. The people and the press insisted upon immediate activity, a campaign against Richmond; and the Lincoln administration, responsive and sensitive to the popular will, yielded.<sup>4</sup> The disaster at Bull Run had as one cause premature haste, the result, partially at least, of popular demand. Not long after this untoward event, on July 27, 1861, General McClellan, summoned from his successful campaigns in West Virginia, was placed in chief command in the field of military forces of the United States. He proceeded during the autumn of 1861, as both enemies and friends agree, with extraordinary ability to organize the inexperienced volunteers into a disciplined army capable of sustained military effort. This imperatively necessary step caused a delay, whether justified as to length or not, and the public became again impatient and later, as the months passed without the appearance of a general movement, vocally insistent for action. Representing the radicals, the "Jacobins" as John Hay called them, Senators Wade, Chandler, and Trumbull came to Washington on October 26 "to worry the administration into a battle".<sup>5</sup> They conferred with the President, and the first two then visited the camp of the Army of the Potomac where they interviewed McClellan. Senator Wade later in a speech to the people of Cincinnati described this meeting as follows:

It was at a time when the very capital of the nation was almost in a state of siege, when foreign nations began to look upon us as a conquered people, and when all the friends of the government were overwhelmed with shame and humiliation. Smarting under the effect of this state of things we went down to the camp and found a man who was General-in-Chief of the whole army of the United States. We found him in command of 190,000 of the best men that ever marshaled under the banner of battle. Never was an army got together, comprising the patriotism and intelligence that were found under that General. It was the first rally of the patriotic host—the flower of the Republic to save the nation from destruction. . . . Yet the rebels were almost in sight of the capital, flaunting their rattlesnake flag in our very faces. How could you ask us to submit to this degradation without at least knowing the reason for the necessity? We had an interview with Gen. McClellan, and remonstrated with him for permitting this disgrace and dishonor of a great nation. We exhorted him, for God's sake, to at least push back the defiant traitors. Why can't you do it?

"Oh, I have not men enough." (Laughter.)

<sup>4</sup> Rhodes, *History of the Civil War, 1861-1865*, pp. 37, 60-61; Johnston, *Bull Run, its Strategy and Tactics*, p. 113.

<sup>5</sup> Hay, *Diary and Letters*, I. 48; quoted, Rhodes, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

How many men have you? I know you have 160,000.

"Well, you have got nearer the number than others have."

And more, I know that you have 190,000. How strong, pray tell, are the rebels?

"Oh, they are at least 220,000 or more, and they are behind fortifications stronger than those of Sebastopol."<sup>6</sup>

Wade said that they then protested to Lincoln, who sought to reassure them with the statement that McClellan was a good general. Despairing of effecting further results by these means, they turned to Congress with the hope that some impression might be made by legislative action.

Prior to this interview and possibly to the entertainment of the idea of an appeal to Congress, there occurred an incident which, stimulating or confirming that idea, brought about a determination for at least an investigation. This event was the disastrous affair at Ball's Bluff on October 21. Here, at a point on the river above Washington, a considerable force, first under the command of Colonel Devens and later under that of Colonel Edward D. Baker, which had been sent over for reconnoissance purposes, was attacked by a superior Confederate force and cut to pieces. The casualties were heavy, many men were captured, and many driven into the river. Among those who were killed in this engagement was Colonel Baker, a prominent senator from Oregon, a dear friend of President Lincoln, and a popular orator. The loss of this senator, the crushing defeat of the Unionist forces which had greatly elated the South, and the discontent of the radicals at the failure of McClellan to advance, made an investigation of the Ball's Bluff matter inevitable. On the first day of the regular session of Congress, December 2, 1861, Roscoe Conkling in the House of Representatives introduced a resolution requesting the Secretary of War to give information whether any, and, if any, what steps had been taken to ascertain who was responsible for the disaster at Ball's Bluff.<sup>7</sup> The resolution was adopted without debate.

In the Senate, three days later, Chandler, of Michigan, introduced a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee of three members to inquire into the disasters at Bull Run and Edwards's Ferry (Ball's Bluff).<sup>8</sup> As soon as this resolution was offered, other senators wished to amend it by the addition of names

<sup>6</sup> Wade, *Facts for the People* (pamphlet), pp. 1-2; cf. *Cincinnati Gazette*, October 24, 1864.

<sup>7</sup> *Congressional Globe*, 37 Cong., 2 sess., pt. I., p. 6. The request was refused. Cf. Conkling's speech, January 6, 1862, Conkling, *Life and Letters of Roscoe Conkling*, pp. 139-148.

<sup>8</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 2 sess., pt. I., p. 16.

of disasters which they thought should be investigated. Senator Grimes said that he preferred to substitute for the pending resolution one that would authorize the committee to "inquire into the causes of the disasters that have attended the public arms".<sup>9</sup> Chandler opposed any addition to his list, holding that the duties of such a committee would be arduous, that it would have to visit various parts of the country, whereas the scenes of the disasters he desired to investigate were within easy reach from the capital. He stated, however, that he would vote for such a committee as that desired by Grimes. Senator Lane, of Kansas, persisted in thinking that Wilson Creek, where the brave General Lyon fell, and the failure of the authorities to relieve Lexington, required investigation; and finally that the country deserved to know the truth about General Frémont's administration. The Senate refused to add these disasters to the list of Chandler. Grimes then offered a resolution creating a committee of two members of the Senate and three of the House of Representatives with power to inquire generally into the disasters that had befallen the Union arms. On the request of Fessenden, the consideration of the matter was postponed for a day to allow the senators to reflect on the subject.

In the important debate which took place the next day, Senators Chandler, Pomeroy, McDougall, Grimes, Foster, Fessenden, Sherman, and others participated. Chandler expressed the hope that the Senate would not give the proposed committee a "roving commission" to go over the United States looking for disasters to investigate. If a comprehensive inquiry was to be made, he favored a number of committees, each having a special topic and a particular field. Pomeroy appeared to fear, as did several others, that the investigations might implicate certain civil officials, thus leading to impeachment; and, because of this possibility, he thought that the committee should originate in the House of Representatives. Grimes, proposing to change his resolution by having three members of the Senate and four of the House, said: "I believe that the best interests of the country, the reputation of the country, the reputation of the Army, and the reputation of the officers of the Army, require that there should be some investigation",<sup>10</sup> and he pointed out that with respect to Bull Run there had been explanations claiming that the presence of civilians had caused the defeat, that the disaster was attributable to the fact that the battle had been fought on Sunday, and again that it was due to the cowardice of the militia and

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 29.

the incapacity of the officers. The country should know which of these explanations, if any one, was true; and it should know about the administration of General Frémont. "Let the country know the facts. If they condemn General Frémont, let him be condemned; if they justify him, then in God's name let him be justified." To Grimes, also, success in the future depended upon an intelligent use of knowledge respecting the faults and errors of the past—which knowledge could be supplied by such a committee as that he proposed. Foster, of Connecticut, made perhaps the strongest speech against the plan of having a congressional committee of investigation. He foresaw many difficulties and embarrassments, such as the practice of calling soldiers away from the battle-field to testify when their services were needed. And after all, he said, such an inquiry was a matter for the military authorities.

I believe in letting the military authorities manage the army. If they manage it badly we shall make a bad matter worse by tampering and interfering, and that is all that will grow out of our action. If it is badly managed now I am sorry; I do not believe it is; but if it be, in Heaven's name do not let us make it worse by tampering, for worse we shall make it, and only worse.

Senator Fessenden, in a powerful speech, stated that he had doubted the expediency of creating such a committee, but on reflection he had concluded that it would do much good. In his opinion, it was the duty of Congress in war-time not to limit itself merely to making appropriations for the use of the executive in conducting the war, as some seemed to think, but it behooved the legislative department to look carefully into the proceedings relating to that conduct of war affairs, not in a carping spirit, but with every wish to expedite it. Instead of agreeing with Foster, he said:

Sir, I hold the very contrary of the doctrine that we are to leave everything without question, without the slightest complaint, without any inquiry even as to the conduct of this war by the public agents. We know that every day wrongs are perpetrated; we know that every day there are gross frauds perpetrated upon the country by a certain class of men; we know that the people of this country, the soldiers of this country, have in some instances been sacrificed without reason; and we do not know how it was done or by whom it was ordered. . . .

But, sir, while there is this agitation in the public mind; while there are so many ideas afloat; so many accusations, unfounded, perhaps, in a very great degree; and no inquiry is made and no step taken to enlighten the public in relation to the matter—that public which carries on this war, and which furnishes the means for carrying it on—shall we, who are the agents of that public, be told that during its progress, be it longer or shorter, we . . . know nothing, say nothing, and inquire nothing about it? . . . I hold it to be our bounden duty, impressed upon

us by our position here, to keep an anxious, watchful eye over all the executive agents who are carrying on the war at the direction of the people, whom we represent and whom we are bound to protect in relation to this matter.<sup>11</sup>

By such a committee, it is to be presumed, Fessenden thought to redress the balance between the executive and legislative departments, which, as a result of the vast accretion of power to the President incident to the war, was in the opinions of many Congressmen sadly out of adjustment.

Senator Sherman contended that the resolution did not go far enough, and that the committee should do more than inquire into disasters. He said:

The business of voting appropriations is easily disposed of; but if we ignore the high duty imposed upon us as representatives of the people to investigate the conduct of the war and of all the officers of the Government, we neglect the chief duty that is now imposed on us. To confine this inquiry to the disasters of the war would be to cripple and limit the proposed committee in all its operations. In my judgment, this ought to be a committee of inquiry into the general conduct of the war.<sup>12</sup>

There were many things, he said, that ought to be investigated, such as the commissary department, the treatment of fugitive slaves, and the department of the adjutant-general. With respect to all of these potential inquiries, Sherman remarked, "I do not care whom it strikes, where it strikes; if any man in this Government should, with good or bad motive, do anything to injure his country, he ought to be exposed, whatever may be the consequences".

To meet the views of Sherman and Fessenden, Grimes altered his resolution, substituting one which provided for a committee "to inquire into the conduct of the present war, and that they have power to send for persons and papers". Speaking in favor of the new committee, Senator Wilson, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, said:

I am willing, sir, to have this investigation. I have no doubt a committee of the two Houses of Congress will act judiciously, and that facts will be brought out that may explain the affairs that have taken place, and put the responsibility of mistakes where it justly belongs; but I go for it more for the future than for the past, for we should teach men in civil and in military authority that the people expect that they will not make mistakes, and that we shall not be easy with their errors. The public voice demands that all the capacity, all the character, all that men have and are, shall be given to the cause of the

<sup>11</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 2 sess., pt. I, pp. 30-31. Cf. editorial comments of *New York Times*, December 6-10, 1861.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31.

country. I want military men to understand that they are not to stand upon technicalities for the preservation of the old Army, or the getting up of a new one. . . . I should like to see the responsibility of the errors of the past placed where it belongs; but I think the proposition before us, showing the tone and temper of Congress, showing, I think, the will of the people at home, will teach a lesson that may be heeded, and may be, therefore, conducive to the public good.<sup>13</sup>

A vote was then taken and, after the yeas and nays were called for, the result was thirty-three in favor of the resolution and three in opposition.

The resolution came up in the House on December 10, where it was adopted unanimously and without debate, Mr. E. B. Washburne having moved the previous question, which operated, of course, to prevent any discussion.<sup>14</sup>

In addition to the motives for the creation of the committee, which have been expressly stated or vaguely suggested in the foregoing, there were others which apparently exerted no little influence. There was great resentment felt in Congress that the leading generals were Democrats, who appeared not to favor radical action on the slavery questions, and that the heads of various departments concerned with the supplies, munitions, and army patronage were men of that faith. George W. Julian, in a vehement speech in 1863 entitled "The Rebellion—the Mistakes of the Past—the Duty of the Present", said in relation to this condition:

Democratic policy, in the year 1861, gave us as commanders of our three great military departments McClellan, Halleck, and Buell, whose military administrations have so terribly cursed the country; while it impressed upon our volunteer forces in the field such officers as Fitz-John Porter, General Nelson, General Stone, and very many more whose sympathies with the rebels were well known throughout the country. . . . Of the major and brigadier-generals in our armies Demo-

<sup>13</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 2 sess., pt. I., p. 32.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 40. The 38th Congress, in January, 1864, reconstituted the committee, giving it additional powers. The Senate, in this case, proposed to create a committee on the conduct and expenditures of the war. In the House, however, on the recommendation of Thaddeus Stevens, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, which reported it in the following form:

"That a joint committee . . . be appointed to inquire into the conduct and expenditures of the present war; and may further inquire into all the facts and circumstances of contracts and agreements already made, or that may be made, and such contracts and agreements hereafter to be made prior to the final report of the committee, by or with any department of the Government, in anywise connected with, or growing out of the operations of the Government in suppressing the rebellion against its constituted authority; and that the said committee shall have authority to sit during the sessions of either House of Congress, and during the recess of Congress and at such times and places as said committee shall deem proper." *Ibid.*, 38 Cong., 1 sess., pt. I., p. 260.

cratic policy has favored this Republican administration, if I am not mistaken, with over four-fifths,—certainly an overwhelming majority; while those great hives of military patronage the Adjutant-general's Department, the Quartermaster's Department, the Commissary Department, the Ordnance Department, and the Pay Department are all under Democratic control, and have been during the war.<sup>15</sup>

There was also a sort of contempt for the scientific soldier which, whether wholly unjustified or not, caused many to have little respect for what seemed the over-careful methods of the so-called West Point plan of conducting the war. As the Committee on the Conduct of the War put it, the "rebellion" could be ended by fighting and *only* by fighting.<sup>16</sup> Lastly it may be said that the radical element of Congress, led by Stevens, Sumner, and Wade, desired that slavery, at least in the Confederacy, should be abolished by using the war powers of the Constitution, and when this was opposed by the administration and the conservatives, the radicals had to content themselves with this Committee on the Conduct of the War. It was, from this point of view, therefore, the reply of the extremists to the conservatives.

On motion of Chandler, who publicly declined the chairmanship, and privately suggested Wade, the Vice-President was empowered to appoint the three members of the Senate who were to serve on the committee.<sup>17</sup> That official then appointed Benjamin F. Wade of Ohio, Zachariah Chandler of Michigan, and Andrew Johnson of Tennessee. On December 19, the Speaker announced the membership of the House committee as being Messrs. Daniel W. Gooch of Massachusetts, John Covode of Pennsylvania, George W. Julian of Indiana, and Moses F. Odell of New York. Wade, Chandler, Gooch, Julian, and Odell were continued as members of the committee throughout its existence. Johnson withdrew on his appointment as military governor of Tennessee and his resignation from the Senate.<sup>18</sup> He was followed on the committee successively by

<sup>15</sup> Julian, *Speeches on Political Questions, 1850-1868*, pp. 202, 204. Cf. Bancroft, *Speeches of Carl Schurz*, I. 209, 210, 211, 217, 218.

<sup>16</sup> *Report of the Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War*, 1863, pt. I., p. 66. The citations to the reports hereinafter to be made will be in the form: C. C. W.

<sup>17</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 2 sess., pt. I., p. 110.

<sup>18</sup> Riddle, *Life of Benjamin F. Wade*, p. 247, says: "I think Johnson never acted upon this committee. It was no place for him." The statement is without foundation, for Johnson, as the Journal shows, was an active member of the committee. After he acceded to the presidency, which fact was immediately pleasing to the committee, Wade, on April 15, 1865, asked for an interview, saying, "I am instructed by the Committee on the Conduct of the War to inform you that your old associates upon that committee would be pleased to wait upon you. . . ."



Joseph A. Wright of Indiana, who served until his term expired, by Benjamin F. Harding of Oregon, who was appointed during the 38th Congress, but resigned from the committee in January, 1865, and by Charles R. Buckalew of Pennsylvania. Of the House committee, the membership remained constant with the exception of Covode, who was succeeded by Benjamin F. Loan, a radical from Missouri, the sole member of the committee who had served in the army.<sup>19</sup> On December 20, the committee met for organization in the room of the Senate Committee on Territories, of which Wade was chairman, as he was to be of the joint committee. No one of the members, with the exception of Chandler, had participated in the debate; so there is no immediate expression of opinion from the committee other than that all voted for the resolution.

All of the members, excepting Chandler, who was a successful merchant of Detroit, were lawyers; but no one of the committee, as first organized, had had any military experience. Four—Wade, Chandler, Julian, and Covode—were members of the radical faction of the Republican party. Julian was a son-in-law of Joshua R. Giddings; Wade had been Giddings's law-partner; both of them together with Chandler were out-and-out abolitionists, admirers of General Frémont, and all were hopeful that the war would not end without drastic action being taken upon the institution of slavery.<sup>20</sup> Gideon Welles attributed to Wade, at this time of his career, a fine character, describing him as being plain, single-minded, honest, unambitious; and, by others, he was called "Honest Ben Wade".<sup>21</sup> He was the most prominent and powerful member of the committee and exercised a controlling influence.<sup>22</sup> Chandler, more of a radical than Wade even, was also an able man, though he has been described as coarse and vulgar.<sup>23</sup> He was certainly unduly suspicious and sometimes not a little crude, though he was an eloquent speaker. His great influence in the committee was felt in the deliberations

They wished to communicate "valuable information" obtained during their recent trip to Richmond. The committee also ordered the clerk to enter upon the Journal that an "exceedingly satisfactory interview" had occurred. *Journal, C. C. W.*, 1865, pt. I., p. xxxvi.

<sup>19</sup> He had been a brigadier-general of Missouri volunteers, but had withdrawn from the army when elected to Congress in 1862. He was immediately appointed to a place on the Committee on Military Affairs, but was shifted to that on the Conduct of the War when it was reconstituted in 1864.

<sup>20</sup> For Julian, see his own *Political Recollections*; and for Wade, Riddle, *op. cit.*

<sup>21</sup> Welles, *Diary of Gideon Welles*, III. 362-363.

<sup>22</sup> Montgomery Blair thought that Wade should have been made Secretary of War instead of Stanton.

<sup>23</sup> The *Detroit Post and Tribune*, *Zachariah Chandler*, pp. 215-249.

over policy, and as the friend, adviser, and confidant of Wade. Since he was not a lawyer, he participated but little in the questioning of witnesses. Of the House committee, Gooch was clearly the most active. He was a conservative Republican, a supporter of the President, though he believed in the work of the committee and gave to his share of it both enthusiasm and ability. The Democratic minority in the committee had a degree of influence not ordinarily possessed by minorities in the committees of that time. So long as Johnson remained in the Senate, he took an active part, examining witnesses and serving on subcommittees, but his successors were not allowed the same powers. Odell, of the House committee, was a War-Democrat, who wanted a vigorous war and who did not support McClellan.

The majority of the committee became progressively more radical as the war continued, so that by 1864 it was an anti-administration organization. Wade and Chandler became acrimonious in their criticism of Lincoln. Yet at its inception the committee was not considered hostile to the administration nor was its creation necessarily a break between the legislative and executive departments of the government. The reports and journal of the committee show a willing co-operation with the executive. Nicolay and Hay, in their biographical history of Lincoln, and Welles, in his *Diary*, make no allusion to any initial hostility of the committee nor to any overt opposition of the President to its creation.<sup>24</sup> Such a committee, if one considers the character of the war, was probably inevitable; and, as its creation was symptomatic of the popular unrest, Mr. Lincoln with his usual tact and political discernment yielded. And the committee, although constituted as a sort of censor of the government and of necessity a check upon the executive, seems to have made no attempt, at least during the first two years, to compromise the government. The committee, remark the aforementioned biographers of Lincoln, were "always earnest, patriotic, and honest". If we resolve in their favor any doubts—and there have been some—as to the last-named characteristic, the statement is correct. The committee were certainly in earnest and, furthermore, were thoroughly and unalterably patriotic.<sup>25</sup>

The simple yet comprehensive statement of the resolution, that the committee should inquire into the conduct of the war, seems to

<sup>24</sup> Welles, *Diary*, I. 262; cf. his attitude later, II. 226. That the President did at first oppose the committee is shown by Senator Edmunds, *The Republic*, April, 1875.

<sup>25</sup> Nicolay and Hay, *Abraham Lincoln: a History*, V. 150. Optimistic patriotism was characteristic of their reports.

have conferred on it plenary powers of investigation. These powers were as broad as they were absolute, for it is difficult to discover any large activity of the administration in that period from 1861 to 1865 that did not have a more or less close relation to the conduct of the war. Such vastly important affairs as military policy, tactics, and strategy; availability and fitness of commanders; army organization in all details; munitions and supplies; army police regulations and military prisons; hospitals; battles and disasters—all, with corresponding aspects of naval organization, practices, and policies, had, of course, a direct and obvious relationship to the conduct of the war; and it did not require a loose construction of the resolution to demonstrate the legal propriety of investigations into any or all of these subjects. From time to time, also, a large number of special inquiries were assigned to the committee by Congress, each assignment carrying with it authority sufficient for the matter in hand or drawing upon the large grant of power delegated in the original concurrent resolution. As has been mentioned already, the 38th Congress, in January, 1864, in addition to the general powers of investigation, laid specific emphasis upon certain classes of inquiries that should be made, such as into expenditures and contracts, made or to be made, which were associated with the attempt to bring the war to a successful conclusion.<sup>26</sup> Thus, the committee was legally empowered to inquire into any activity of the public agents associated immediately or remotely with the prosecution of the war.

The committee conceived that its duties would be best fulfilled not by advocating legislation, but, to put it in their language,

by endeavoring to obtain such information in respect to the conduct of the war as would best enable them to advise what mistakes had been made in the past and the proper course to be pursued in the future; to obtain such information as the many and laborious duties of the President and his cabinet prevented them from acquiring, and to lay it before them with such recommendations and suggestions as seemed to be most imperatively demanded; and the journal of the proceedings of your committee show that, for a long time, they were in constant communication with the President and his cabinet and neglected no opportunity of at once laying before them the information acquired by them in the course of their investigations.

There is abundant evidence to show that the committee exercised these advisory powers. The question immediately arises as to whether such powers were granted by Congress and whether such had been the purpose of Congress in creating the committee. It is

<sup>26</sup> *Report C. C. W.*, 1863, pt. I., p. 4.

doubtful whether these questions can be authoritatively answered. Some of the enemies of the committee were ready to admit that a "candid and systematic inquiry" into the conduct of the war was both legitimate and highly desirable, but when, as they said, the committee arrogated to itself conciliar powers and sought to interfere in the conduct of the war, they felt that it had transcended its delegated authority and its abilities.<sup>27</sup> However this may have been, the functions and activities of the committee divide themselves roughly into two divisions—the investigative and the recommendatory or advisory; and it will perhaps be acceptable to treat these respective classes of activity in that order.

Most of the investigations of military affairs were made in the East; the most systematic related to the Army of the Potomac.<sup>28</sup> With the exception of Grant, an inquiry was made into the administrations of all the generals in command of that army. The exception mentioned was due to the peculiar relationship of General Grant and General Meade, who remained in immediate command, and to the fact that the civil authorities interfered less in the Virginia campaigns of Grant than in those of his predecessors. The battles and campaigns investigated in this connection were as follows: the Peninsula campaign and the battles incident to it, the second battle of Manassas and the Pope campaign, and the Maryland campaign of McClellan. At the same time with these investigations, an inquiry was made into the disasters at Bull Run and Ball's Bluff.<sup>29</sup> Investigations of the battles of Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, and Gettysburg were made, and the last two were accompanied with searching examinations of the military administrations of Generals Hooker and Meade.<sup>30</sup> Later, testimony was taken respecting the battle of Petersburg and the affair at the Crater.<sup>31</sup>

Thorough investigations were made of the Red River and Fort Fisher expeditions.<sup>32</sup> Testimony was taken, but no reports were prepared, on a large number of expeditions, battles, and what might be called detached military operations: the campaigns of General Rosecrans;<sup>33</sup> the Hatteras Inlet expedition; the Fort Royal expedition; the Burnside expedition; the battle at Fort Donelson;

<sup>27</sup> Hurlbert, *General McClellan and the Conduct of the War*, p. 160.

<sup>28</sup> *Report C. C. W.*, 1863, pt. I., p. 4.

<sup>29</sup> *Journal, C. C. W.*, 1863, pt. I., pp. 67-68; *Report, ibid.*, pts. I. and II.

<sup>30</sup> *Report C. C. W.*, 1865, pt. I., pp. xli-lxxvii, 3-524; cf. *Senate Rep. No. 71*,

37 Cong., 3 sess.

<sup>31</sup> *Report C. C. W.*, 1865, pt. I., third division, pp. 1-247.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, pt. II.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 1864-1865, pt. III.

the capture of New Orleans; the invasion of New Mexico; the Accomack expedition; the battle of Winchester; the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac*;<sup>34</sup> the operations against Charleston; the operations in the Gulf Department; and the battle of Cedar Mountain.<sup>35</sup> Notably important investigations relating more directly to the civil aspects of the war or to the work of supplying the army may be grouped as follows: heavy ordnance,<sup>36</sup> light-draught monitors<sup>37</sup>—on the testimony taken in these inquiries reports were submitted—treatment of Confederate soldiers in Union prisons, the paymaster's department,<sup>38</sup> the administration of the quartermasters located in New York and Philadelphia, ice contracts, returning slaves to their "rebel" owners,<sup>39</sup> trade regulations as applied on the Mississippi River,<sup>40</sup> trade in military districts,<sup>41</sup> "protecting rebel property", treatment of wounded from Front Royal, the convalescent camp at Alexandria, and the Sherman-Johnston terms of surrender.<sup>42</sup> One of the most interesting investigations of the committee was that of the Western Department or Missouri during the Frémont régime, which evidenced their peculiar partizan politics and their radicalism.<sup>43</sup> Another such inquiry was made of the administration of General Steele in Arkansas, but it had not the same political interest nor was it accompanied with a report as in the other case.<sup>44</sup> An investigation was made of the cruel massacre of the Cheyenne Indians, and a report was made strongly condemning Colonel Chivington.<sup>45</sup>

The committee also essayed to investigate the way in which the Confederates conducted the war. The most important of these inquiries was that of the alleged massacre at Fort Pillow, and of the report and testimony 20,000 copies were printed for the use of the Senate and 40,000 for the House of Representatives.<sup>46</sup> Analogous investigations were those on the treatment of Union soldiers in Southern prisons, "rebel barbarities", and the use made by Southerners of the Indians.

<sup>34</sup> *Report C. C. W.*, 1863, pt. III.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 1864-1865, pt. III.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 1865, pt. II.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 1864-1865, pt. III.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 1862-1863, pt. III.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 1864-1865, pt. III.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 1862-1863, pt. III.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 1864-1865, pt. III.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 1863, pt. III.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 1864-1865, pt. III.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> *Sen. Rep. Com. No. 63*, 38 Cong., 1 sess.

In addition to the work of the committee already mentioned, Congress by special resolutions directed it to investigate many important yet minor details of the conduct of the war. Others may be referred to by way of illustration, such as: the truth of an editorial of the *Chicago Tribune* in which it was alleged that some of the cartridges supplied for the Burnside expedition had no powder in them;<sup>47</sup> the treatment by the rebels of the remains of Union soldiers at Manassas; certain claims of individuals, notably that of Marshall O. Roberts for the loss of his ship, *The Star of the Golden West*; the acts of Congress respecting commercial intercourse with rebel states; the military expedition to the coast of Florida; petitions for the removal of certain generals; the construction of iron-clad steamers; the employment of disloyal persons in the navy yards; the prison of the provost guard at Alexandria; the truth of the charge that the authorities armed disloyal persons in Missouri; the Wilmington expedition; and the treatment of negroes by General Jefferson C. Davis of Sherman's army.<sup>48</sup> It is very significant also, as showing the attitude of the War Department toward the committee, that the secretary requested the committee to investigate the quartermaster's department at New York.<sup>49</sup>

In order to obtain testimony, the committee not only held sessions in Washington, but travelled to various parts of the country in search of it. The inquiries outside of Washington were usually made by subcommittees, and the combinations of men most often used for this purpose were either that of Wade and Gooch, or Gooch and Odell, the most active men on the joint committee. In their travels, the committee or subcommittees visited the cities or towns of Alexandria, City Point, Fortress Monroe, Manassas, Centreville, Falmouth, Petersburg, and Richmond, in Virginia; New York City, Baltimore, Annapolis, Boston; Mound City and Cairo, Illinois; Columbus, Kentucky; and Fort Pillow and Memphis, Tennessee. They not only visited battle-fields, but on one occasion at least, when the Confederates were before Washington, certain members personally reconnoitred the enemy works and fortifications in

<sup>47</sup> *Journal, C. C. W.*, 1863, pt. I., p. 80.

<sup>48</sup> *Report C. C. W.*, 1864-1865, pt. III.

<sup>49</sup> *Journal, C. C. W.*, 1865, pt. I., xvi. Supplementing these various reports and investigations, authorized by the 37th and 38th Congresses, the 39th Congress, in 1866, ordered the publication of a two-volume report. This supplement consists of the answers of Generals Sherman, Thomas, Pope, J. G. Foster, Pleasonton, Hitchcock, Sheridan, and Ricketts to certain questions which had been sent to them by the committee in 1865. There is also a communication and a memorial of Norman Wiard. *Supplement, Report C. C. W.*, 1866, vols. I. and II.

order to form an opinion as to the expediency of an advance by the Union armies.

An inquiry usually followed promptly on a disaster, and one penalty of failure was a hearing before the grim committee. At these times, as well as at others, the chairman and Gooch were likely to be the most active interrogators, for the committee did not have an attorney, nor did they permit the presence of counsel for those who testified. They were frequently charged with unfairness in framing their questions, that is, with asking questions which did not elicit the whole truth, questions which avoided certain vital points. The witness was usually permitted, even requested or ordered, to state all that he wanted to say, or to tell all that he knew, about the matter under consideration; yet these lusty partizans could and sometimes did use their great powers very much as their critics have described. General Meade, who, as we shall see, was one on whom the eyes of certain members of the committee rested for a time unfavorably, wrote in this connection:

I feared the Committee on the Conduct of the War was against me, and that their examination would be *ex-parte*; to which their organization, the absence of myself or counsel, the ignorance I am under of what is testified against me, all combine to give a great power for injury, if abused.<sup>50</sup>

In this passage, reference was made to the secret sessions of the committee. The members were pledged not to reveal the secrets of the committee, nor the information which came into their possession there, although this rule was modified on July 15, 1862, to the effect that any member might use the testimony in any way he chose in speeches in either house of Congress.<sup>51</sup> While there were sometimes rumors, newspaper reports, and surmises as to what was being testified before the committee, the subject-matter on the whole was kept secret. But the methods of the committee in taking this testimony, and in seeking for a victim when investigating disasters, have received severe criticism. Speaking of the part the committee had in the arrest and imprisonment of General Stone, one of these critics said:

The Committee on the Conduct of the War proceeded to investigate Ball's Bluff by the methods common to nearly all similar bodies. Witnesses were summoned and examined without order; there was no cross-examination; the accused was not confronted with the witnesses nor told their names, nor the charge upon which he had been already tried,

<sup>50</sup> Meade, *Life and Letters of General Meade*, II. 179.

<sup>51</sup> Journal, *C. C. W.*, 1863, pt. I., p. 100. This was the day before Chandler made his famous speech against McClellan.



condemned, and sentenced before he was even allowed to appear. No one was responsible. Of many important details there was no record.<sup>52</sup>

Similar to this was the vehement, but unavailing, protest of General W. B. Franklin against the injustice which he alleged to have been done him in the committee's report on the battle of Fredericksburg:

It is a sad commentary upon the disjointed condition of the times, that at the very moment when the Nation is offering its blood and treasure without stint in the effort to preserve inviolate the principles of civil liberty, a citizen of that nation, however humble, shall be accused, tried and condemned of an infamous crime, before a tribunal sitting in secret session, without notice, or even an intimation of the charges made against him; without the opportunity to confront or examine the witnesses brought against him; to be himself called and interrogated, in utter ignorance that he is under trial; and, finally, to be denied permission to produce witnesses, when the fact became apparent to him that he was, for some unexplained reason, in danger of condemnation.<sup>53</sup>

The committee had stated that General Franklin had failed in a crisis in the battle of Fredericksburg to attack with his entire force, which attack, if it had been made, would have brought the army, in the words of the committee, "a most brilliant victory". On this interesting matter, a letter of General Meade throws considerable light. "My conversations", said Meade, "with Burnside and Wade satisfied me that Franklin was to be made responsible for the failure at Fredericksburg, and the committee is seeking all the testimony they can procure to substantiate this theory of theirs". Of the report of the committee he said, "It is terribly severe upon Franklin"; and later, after he had investigated the matter somewhat, he stated that he knew that Franklin was blameless. Franklin himself charged the committee with making an unjustified report, with taking excerpts from his testimony dissociated from the context, and with suppressing the testimony as a whole. Even in this case, however, the general and leading question was: "Will you describe fully and particularly what was done by the left wing of our army at the battle of Fredericksburg, or that portion of it under your command?" Such a question certainly gave an ample opportunity for testimony and defense.

Another method, said to have been utilized in the case of McClellan and certainly employed in the investigation of Meade, was to omit to call witnesses who were in sympathy with the person against whom the antipathies of the committee had been aroused.

<sup>52</sup> Irwin, in *Battles and Leaders*, II. 133.

<sup>53</sup> Franklin, *A Reply of Major-General W. B. Franklin*, p. 5.

One of McClellan's friends charged that such generals as Howard, Porter, and Meagher, who had a high regard for their commander's generalship in the Peninsula, were not called before the committee.<sup>54</sup> The same friend alleged that the committee admitted much hearsay evidence and asked many leading questions, indicating to the witness the nature of the reply desired. The criticism of the methods of the committee, however, reached further than merely to the character of the questions. There was something of the character of the Court of Star Chamber about the committee. Whether this similarity was due to the very nature of the institution, to the personal animus which sometimes seemed to control the members, to the fact that a political favorite required exoneration, or that the immediate problem was shot through with political considerations—is difficult to determine.

One of the severe critics of the committee, after stating that they did not limit themselves to an inquiry into things actually accomplished, said with reference to the duties otherwise assumed: "They considered themselves to be a sort of Aulic Council clothed with authority to supervise the plans of commanders in the field, to make military suggestions, and to dictate military appointments."<sup>55</sup> The committee, having constant meetings or communications with the Secretary of War and conferring at intervals with the President—sometimes at their request and sometimes at his invitation—many of which meetings lasted for hours—having the support of a great majority of Congress, and being, as they maintained, the true representatives of the people—did exercise the high powers mentioned in the quotation. Whether they did it well or ill was a matter of controversy, but, when they proposed legislation, advised the President and his Secretary of War as to the proper methods and policies, promoted the fortunes of certain generals, and unmade those of others, they were exercising functions which to their minds were not ancillary and subordinate, but primary and essential.

Although they did not conceive it as one of their duties to consider and urge legislation, two important measures were advocated by them. The first, a joint rule of parliamentary procedure, pro-

<sup>54</sup> Ketchum, *General McClellan's Peninsula Campaign* (booklet). There is the charge, too, that the committee published the report before giving the testimony to the press, the inference being that many would read the one, form their opinions, and ignore the other.

<sup>55</sup> Hurlbert, *op. cit.*, p. 160; cf. Swinton, *Campaigns of the Army of the Potomac*, p. 89, in which he wrote of the committee as a "species of Aulic Council" by which, with the aid of Stanton, "all the larger of the war-questions were determined". For the Aulic Council, see Herchenhahn, *Geschichte des Kaiserlichen Reichshofraths* (Mannheim, 1791-1793).

vided that when the executive desired immediate action upon any matter pertaining to the prosecution of the war, either or both houses of Congress should promptly go into secret session for the consideration of it, and the debate, in case the previous question should not be ordered, was to be limited to five minutes for any member.<sup>56</sup> In the second place, Senator Wade proposed a bill to authorize the President to take possession of the railway and telegraph lines.<sup>57</sup>

A suggestion was sent by letter to the Secretary of War, January 23, 1862, to the effect that, from evidence received from high officers, it appeared that the army had sufficient cavalry force and that new regiments then in process of mobilizing could be dispensed with. This was urged as "a very important matter" in view of the great expense of that arm of the service.<sup>58</sup>

With respect to the blockade of the Potomac by the Confederate forces and batteries, the committee took a decided stand, insisting that the tolerance of the blockade was a disgrace, and was damaging the country in the eyes of the outside nations, and that the failure of McClellan to break it constituted a grave blunder. A subcommittee, composed of Wade and Johnson, called on the Secretary of War to lay before him the ideas of the committee. As reported by Johnson, Wade represented to Stanton the serious importance of the matter, and told him of the complaints of merchants and the letters of American citizens abroad which revealed the foreign attitude. To all of these views Stanton gave ready agreement, saying "that he did not go to his bed at night without his cheek burning with shame at this disgrace upon the nation". He then brought McClellan, who was in the building, into the room, to whom the complaint and suggestion of the committee were repeated. After stating that the subject had been considered by him and that it was a matter of days when he would take active steps to remedy the situation, McClellan said that he was opposed to sending men over the Potomac without adequate numbers and provisions for their safe retreat. He proposed to construct a bridge. Wade declared that with 150,000 of the best troops in the world, there was no need of a bridge, that he ought to take the men over to fight, and if they could not defeat the enemy, "let them come back in their coffins". Johnson then said that

<sup>56</sup> Journal, *C. C. W.*, 1863, pt. I., p. 76.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 76-77.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 77; cf. testimony of General Heintzelman, p. 119; testimony of General Franklin, p. 122; General Pleasonton, *Supplement*, 1866, II. 3-4.

the interview with the Secretary had been a very satisfactory one; that the Secretary listened attentively to all that the chairman said, and although the chairman sometimes made his statements to General McClellan in pretty strong and emphatic language, the Secretary endorsed every sentiment he uttered.<sup>59</sup>

After hearing the testimony of several generals and consulting many scientific works on the subject, the committee decided that the army ought to be divided into *corps d'armée*, and they set about with characteristic energy to secure such an organization by carrying the matter to Lincoln and later to the President and the Cabinet. Having a good cause, their determination became the more fixed as McClellan appeared to oppose the idea. He declared that his reason was not opposition to the principle, but that he did not want to promote men to the grade of major-general without having first tried them on the battlefield. The committee won in the contest, and the President on the eve of the departure for the Peninsula campaign issued an order requiring such an organization and appointed, to command the corps, men who had not been previously approved by McClellan.<sup>60</sup>

Another suggestion of the committee is mentioned as being in itself important and as showing the methods of the committee in making use of testimony. An investigation was made of the conditions of the hospital called "Camp Convalescent" at Alexandria, where certain abuses had appeared. A subcommittee, consisting of Gooch, Covode, and Odell, visited the Secretary of War, made representations to him, and urged that barracks and proper accommodations be provided for the sick and wounded. They insisted upon the appointment of an inspector who should visit the various hospitals and have authority to discharge men who were unfit for further service in the war.<sup>61</sup> Here was an effort to break through bureaucratic red tape and official routine.

One of the most important activities of the committee, and perhaps the most interesting, was its exercise of the power to discipline general officers and commanders. The most notable instances of this sort of activity were the cases of Generals Stone, Franklin, McClellan, Meade, Sickles, Burnside, and Brown.<sup>62</sup> There were

<sup>59</sup> Journal, *C. C. W.*, 1863, pt. I., pp. 84-85.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 86; McClellan, *Own Story*, p. 113.

<sup>61</sup> Journal, *C. C. W.*, 1863, pt. I., p. 103.

<sup>62</sup> Space is not available to treat all of the cases. Of those not mentioned in the body of the article, it may be said that Sickles was reported to the Secretary of War because of alleged irregularities in his quartermaster's department and that Brigadier-General Brown's removal as a commander in Missouri was demanded. But the committee could aid as well as injure. A story of Meade's

cases, also, when the committee loyally supported men with an equal intensity of purpose, such as Frémont, Hooker, Butler, and Stanton. Most of the instances of the committee's censuring prominent generals occurred in connection with the Army of the Potomac. The son and biographer of General Meade says:

The Army of the Potomac unfortunately furnished, through its proximity to the capital, a fine opportunity to the committee for the exercise of its peculiar theories as to the proper mode of conducting a great war, and at the committee's door can justly be laid the incentives to most of the intrigues, rivalries, and dissensions that marred the otherwise brilliant record of that army.<sup>63</sup>

He speaks of "animus", "machinations", and "conspiracy" in association with the committee; so have others who have written in defense of men who felt the weight of the committee's disapproval.

The first victim was General Charles P. Stone, against whom was made what amounted to a charge of treason. It was reported to the Secretary of War that he was in undue communication with the enemy. The evidence was trivial, the charge unfounded, but when it seemed to be confirmed by a refugee Stone was arrested and confined without trial at Fort Lafayette.<sup>64</sup> Another decision of the committee which appears to have been unjust was the determination to fix upon General Franklin the blame for the failure at Fredericksburg.<sup>65</sup> The attitude of the committee toward McClellan was that of bitter animosity, and their hostility extended to the officers who were friendly to him. In this case, the committee members were in alliance with Stanton and Chase of the Cabinet. The situation was a very complex one. The committee sought to play a large part in the military game and McClellan, though very reticent as to plans, allowed himself to write many political letters, some of which were decidedly in bad taste. In practical politics, the committee were easily his masters, and they were better as military men than he was as a politician. He had a contempt for the committee as meddling civilians; they felt that he was incapable, that his heart was not in the struggle, that his plans were wrong,

seems pertinent. Halleck said to Colonel Poe, who sought promotion and who bore letters of recommendation, "to be frank with you, Colonel Poe, with only such letters your chances of promotion are about equal to those of a *stumped-tail bull in fly-time*". Meade adds that *merit without political influence* is no argument to the authorities. Chandler was opposed to Poe. Meade, *op. cit.*, I. 324.

<sup>63</sup> Meade, *op. cit.*, II. 171; cf. also II. 169-170.

<sup>64</sup> Irwin, in *Battles and Leaders*, *ubi supra*; Porter, *In Memory of General Charles P. Stone*; McDougall, *The Arrest of General Stone*, speech, April 15, 1862.

<sup>65</sup> Ropes, *Story of the Civil War*, II. 442. He thought Franklin should have succeeded McClellan; cf. *Battles and Leaders*, III. 106.

that he would never act with energy, and ultimately they came to charge him with treason. On his side, it was alleged that the politicians were in a conspiracy, that they did not want him to win the war, and that he was finally removed just when he "had the game in his hands".<sup>66</sup> The radicals increased the pressure they were able to exert upon the President. Chandler, on July 16, 1862, speaking for the committee, and with the approval of Stanton, described the general manner in which the war had been conducted, closing with a terrific attack upon McClellan. The committee held no session from July 6 to December 5, 1862; so when McClellan was removed on November 7, it had no corporate part in it, yet probably it was largely instrumental in effecting McClellan's fall.<sup>67</sup>

In their relations with Burnside as commander, the committee appeared as the deputies of Congress on mission to the army, and, on their return to Washington, they acted as advisors of the administration. To state the history briefly, the committee was directed by special resolutions adopted after the assemblage of Congress in December, 1862, to investigate the disaster and the later movements of Burnside. The first resolution was passed on the 18th, the examination of witnesses at Falmouth, Virginia, to which point the committee went, occurred on the 19th, and a report was read in the Senate on the 23d. In it there were the familiar references to the failure of the authorities to send the pontoon bridges in time to make an advance across the river so that Fredericksburg might have been seized before the enemy could concentrate, and there appears also the unfortunate and unjust criticism of General Franklin. It was significant that the first witness to mention an opinion that Franklin had been remiss was General Hooker. This provisional report, however, consisted of testimony alone, it being submitted without any save explanatory remarks by the committee.<sup>68</sup> General John Cochrane attacks the committee's next step, to paraphrase his remarks, as follows: When it appeared that Burnside was contemplating a second movement, the inquisitorial committee appeared on the battle-field to question the men about conditions there and about the fitness of Burnside to command. This fact made the general

<sup>66</sup> McClellan, *Own Story*, p. 650.

<sup>67</sup> Irwin, *op. cit.*, III. 102-104; *Detroit Post and Tribune, op. cit.*, p. 229. The committee had little or nothing to do as an organization with the Fitz-John Porter case. The radicals, however, demanded his sacrifice, and the committee probably endorsed the decision of the military court, though, because of the investigation made by that court, it did not "make so thorough an investigation of that campaign [Manassas] as they would otherwise have done"; cf. *General Fitz-John Porter's Reply to Secretary Chandler*.

<sup>68</sup> *Sen. Rep. No. 71*, 37 Cong., 3 sess.

the subject of camp-fire debate, and was detrimental to discipline and *morale*.<sup>69</sup>

If there were questions of this nature asked on the visit of the committee to the army headquarters they did not appear in the report, but such questions were asked of the witnesses who were summoned to Washington. On January 26, the committee was directed to inquire if Burnside had formed any plans for a forward movement and whether any subordinate officers had visited Washington to interfere with the execution of such plans. The testimony secured with respect to this matter exhibits one of the most curious episodes of the war. Generals Newton and Cochrane went to Washington to submit complaints against Burnside, to give testimony that he was incapable of commanding a large army, and to show that his new plans were certain to fail. They first sought to find the committee and give the information to them. Failing because of the holiday recess and the absence of the members from the city, they secured an interview with President Lincoln through Secretary Seward's mediation. They then made the revelations to Mr. Lincoln which caused him to order Burnside not to make any general forward movement without first consulting him.<sup>70</sup> This procedure brought about the complications which finally led to Burnside's relief from command, after which Hooker, the favorite of the committee, was appointed.

Despite Hooker's incapacity to command large bodies of troops, he had the favor of Chase, of the majority of the radicals, and of the committee, the last of whom remained faithful to him throughout the war. He was opposed by Stanton and Halleck, and, when removed, was succeeded by General George G. Meade. When the committee came to investigate the battle of Gettysburg, Generals Sickles and Doubleday, who had been called as witnesses, and later others, testified that General Meade had contemplated a retreat and had prepared an order to that effect before victory was secured, but was prevented from retreating by the attack of Lee. Wishing Hooker restored to command and possibly thinking, certainly alleging, Meade to be incompetent, Wade and Chandler sought the President. On March 4, 1864, the chairman ordered the clerk to enter the following upon the Journal:

Having become impressed with the exceeding importance of the testimony taken by the committee in relation to the army of the Potomac,

<sup>69</sup> Cochrane, *The War for the Union*, a very interesting criticism from a radical.

<sup>70</sup> *Report C. C. W.*, 1863, pt. I., p. 58.



more especially in relation to the incompetency of the general in command of the army, he and Mr. Chandler had believed it to be their duty to call upon the President and the Secretary of War, and lay before them the substance of the testimony taken by them, and, in behalf of the army and the country, demand the removal of General Meade, and the appointment of some one more competent to command. They accordingly did so yesterday afternoon; and being asked what general they could recommend for the command of the army of the Potomac, they said that for themselves they would be content with General Hooker, believing him to be competent; but not being advocates of any particular general, they would say that if there was any general whom the President considered more competent for the command, then let him be appointed. They stated that Congress had appointed the committee to watch the conduct of the war; and unless this state of things should be soon changed it would become their duty to make the testimony public which they had taken, with such comments as the circumstances of the case seemed to require.<sup>71</sup>

A number of high officers held that Meade should have attacked after the third day of Gettysburg, and this opinion was also cited as proof of incompetency. From the testimony and the facts before the committee, it is difficult to see how they could have thought otherwise than they did, though politics was involved, complicating a situation which should have remained a military one only. The testimony and the report based upon it severely condemned General Meade, but the cherished design of the committee, the restoration of Hooker as commander, was not achieved.

During the first years after the creation of the committee, it was in more or less constant communication with the executive.<sup>72</sup> This co-operation was rendered less friendly by the dismissal of Hooker, and was practically discontinued after the presentation of the President's message of December, 1863. Lincoln's plan of reconstruction, or more properly of restoration, encountered the bitter opposition of the majority of the committee, as well as of the radicals in Congress who preferred that of the Wade-Davis Bill, and who endorsed the sentiments of the Wade-Davis Manifesto. This important fact and the no less important one of Grant's appointment, with the consequent diminution of civil interference, greatly diminished the opportunities of the committee in their advisory capacity. It became, therefore, after 1864, less of a council and more of an investigative body.

Another phase of this relationship developed during the election

<sup>71</sup> *Journal, C. C. W.*, 1863, pt. I., p. xix. At the same time, Meade asserted that Wade assured him that there were no charges against him before the committee. Meade, *Life and Letters of General Meade*, II. 169; Walker, in *Battles and Leaders*, III. 406-419.

<sup>72</sup> *Journal, C. C. W.*, 1863, pt. I., p. 4.

campaign of 1864 and after Frémont and Cochrane had agreed to retire from the contest in favor of Lincoln. The committee then came to the substantial aid of the candidate of the Union party. Wade became a campaigner for the President, after the reconciliation effected by the enforced retirement of Montgomery Blair from the Cabinet and the withdrawal of Frémont from the campaign, and employed in his speeches some of the testimony which had been taken by the committee. His speech "Facts for the People" largely consisted of data gathered as chairman of the committee and contained quotations from the testimony of Generals Heintzelman and Hooker. It was widely distributed by the campaign committee. It evoked many replies, such as those by Ketchum, Amos Kendall, and Hurlbert, which served to indicate the importance attached to it by McClellan's associates.<sup>73</sup>

The tangible evidences of the committee's work are the eight stout volumes of testimony, papers, and reports. Much of the activity of the committee as a conciliar body took the form of suggestions, advice, and intrigue—to employ a term then much in vogue—and is thus somewhat imponderable, susceptible rather of an interpretative than of an expository treatment. In the present connection, we have opportunity only to summarize a few of the reports, to estimate the value of the testimony, and to state the use which has been and can be made of it by historians. Reports accompanied the testimony in the following investigations: the Army of the Potomac, Bull Run, Ball's Bluff, Frémont's administration in Missouri, the Red River expedition, the Fort Fisher expedition, the Crater affair, the massacre of the Cheyenne Indians, light-draught monitors, and the Fort Pillow massacre.

Enough has been written above, respecting the Army of the Potomac, to show that the committee were highly critical of McClellan's generalship and suspicious of his integrity; that with little enthusiasm for Burnside they were yet ready to excuse him; that they were ardently and faithfully loyal to Hooker, publishing and endorsing many of his explanations of failure and condemning his removal on the eve of the battle of Gettysburg; that they condemned Meade and his campaign of manoeuvres in Virginia, though they

<sup>73</sup> Ketchum, *General McClellan's Peninsula Campaign*; Kendall, *Letters exposing the Mismanagement of Public Affairs by Abraham Lincoln*; Hurlbert, *General McClellan and the Conduct of the War*. Another campaign booklet which was distributed and which was highly critical of McClellan was that of General Barnard, *The Peninsula Campaign*. It contains his own testimony before the committee and that of Generals Keyes, Heintzelman, Sumner, McCall, Hitchcock, and others. Disseminated by the Union Executive Congressional Committee.

gave the views of generals who approved of him. The investigation of Frémont, largely conducted by Gooch, revealed many irregularities, despite which a majority exonerated him, heartily endorsing his famous proclamation setting free the slaves of disloyal persons, while Gooch and Odell preferred to submit the testimony without comment. There was disagreement as to the proper interpretation of the testimony respecting the Red River expedition, Gooch this time preparing a dissenting report. With reference to the Fort Fisher expedition, the committee absolved Butler, justifying his determination not to assault the fort, and ascribing the failure to a want of "cordiality and co-operation" between army and navy and to a lack of effectiveness of the bombardment.

Investigations of governmental inefficiency and of what may be termed scandals occurred in the cases of light-draught monitors, ice contracts, heavy ordnance, employment of disloyal persons in government work, hospitals and the treatment of wounded, and illicit trade with the Confederates. That there might have been more of such investigations is suggested by the reflection that the committee and Stanton were allies—a fact which led Welles to remark that the committee covered up whatever Stanton desired to conceal.

The Fort Pillow report severely indicted the Southerners and General Forrest. While the testimony largely supported such a verdict, it is interesting to note that the testimony imputed to the negro witnesses was curiously literate.

The space available for this article does not permit the quotation or analysis of any of the testimony. From the standpoint of the student, however, this testimony is an invaluable source of information about the war. It has a value beyond that of the reports of officers. Such reports permit false statements and can be used to defend questionable actions, whereas the testimony was given under oath and the witnesses were examined by men who, when political considerations were absent, were zealous seekers for the truth. Such testimony has been considered authoritative original material by such writers as Rhodes, Johnston, Ropes, Swinton, Lossing, Hosmer,<sup>74</sup> the contributors to *Battles and Leaders*, and others, and must be taken into substantial account by any future historian of the war.

As to the usefulness of such a committee, opinions have widely differed. In writing of an institution to which some have compared the committee, the Aulic Council, Jomini said:

In my judgment, the only duty which such a council can safely un-

<sup>74</sup> Hosmer, *Outcome of the Civil War*, pp. 318–319.

dertake is that of advising as to the adoption of a general plan of operations. . . . I mean a plan which shall determine the objects of a campaign; decide whether offensive or defensive operations shall be undertaken, and fix the amount of material means which may be relied upon in the first instance for the opening of the enterprise, and then for the possible reserves in case of invasion. It cannot be denied that all these things may be, and even should be, discussed in a council of government made up of generals and ministers; but here the action of such a council should stop; for if it pretends to say to a commander-in-chief not only that he shall march on Vienna or Paris, but also in what way he is to manoeuvre to reach those points, the unfortunate commander-in-chief will certainly be beaten, . . .<sup>75</sup>

Lieutenant-Colonel Henderson held that while war is something more than an "outgrowth of politics", the civilian authorities must take a part by judging of the merits of commanders, the character and variety of objectives, and finally of the achievement or non-achievement of the same, but added, "It is hardly necessary to observe that no civilian minister, however deeply he might have studied the art of war, could be expected to solve for himself the strategic problems that come before him."<sup>76</sup> The committee was criticized by him for weakening discipline when making inquiries of subordinates respecting a commanding officer's plans and fitness.<sup>77</sup> Other than this, there is no complaint by any high authority of the investigative powers and rights of the civilian—although there may be, as there has been, criticism of the methods employed.

From these statements, it would seem that the work of investigation was legitimate; that the committee might seek to understand, even to determine, the objectives; that they might suggest, even control, the general character of the campaigns—if it be granted that they had the requisite ability for such important duties. From such views, however, there has been dissent, some holding that the conduct of a war is purely an executive function, a thing for experts. And there have been those who said the committee was unfair and partizan. That they made mistakes, as in overrating Hooker, in underestimating McClellan, in blaming Franklin, and in misinterpreting Meade, may be granted, although they certainly had testimony to substantiate their conclusions. In defense, it may be contended that the committee succeeded in their aims; that they brought speed and energy into the conduct of the war; that they ferreted out abuses and put their fingers down heavily upon governmental inefficiency; and that they labored, for a time at least, to preserve a

<sup>75</sup> Jomini, *Précis de l'Art de la Guerre*, II. 47; quoted in Swinton, *op. cit.*, pp. 96–97.

<sup>76</sup> Henderson, *The Science of War*, p. 18.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 212.

balance and effect a co-operation between the legislative and executive departments. That the committee were not experts, nor men of the highest rank of statesmanship, nor of lofty character, are arguments *ad hominem* rather than *ad institutum*. They were partizans, but they were men of energy; they were often rash and impetuous, but their hearts were in the struggle. If their service as a council be discounted—though the writer is far from asserting that it should be—there was still their great service in giving publicity, in some cases pitiless publicity, to faulty military and questionable political transactions. Exception may be taken to their claim that they had not “sought to accomplish any purpose other than to elicit the truth”, but they were confidently ready to be judged by the result.

WILLIAM WHATLEY PIERSON, JR.

## AUSTRO-GERMAN RELATIONS SINCE 1866

THE diplomatic relations of Austria-Hungary and Germany in the last two generations present a singularly complex evidential problem. The two ends of the period are firmly rooted in the certainty of established fact, but any attempt to fill in the period between them involves the peril of writing the history of the present war in the light of the quarrel of 1866 or of extending present issues back further than facts will warrant. Evidentially we possess firm ground for the aftermath of Sadowa, for the effect upon the relations between Austria-Hungary and Germany of the creation of the Empire and the formation of the Dual Alliance. Out of these grow naturally the Triple Alliance and the latter phases of the statesmanship of Bismarck as he himself liked us to think they were. Then in 1889-1890 comes a radical change. Public relations between the two countries cease to present important incidents, open controversies, or official utterances of obvious importance. From time to time we learn that the Triple Alliance has been renewed, that one emperor has visited the other or has occupied a prominent place at some ceremony,<sup>1</sup> but we have no direct evidence as to the terms on which the Triple Alliance was renewed or as to the real subjects discussed at imperial visits. Inference, guess-work, suggestion, opinion we have in profusion; evidence there is none. We have in addition for this period subsequent to 1890 a documented narrative of parliamentary proceedings and ministerial policies, both in Austria and in Germany, which tells of strong Slav parties pretty definitely hostile to any extension of friendly relations with Germany, of the Magyar fear of the increase of Austrian influence in the Balkans. We see the emperor choose his premiers and foreign secretaries more frequently from these parties than from the German elements and we see the public affairs of the Monarchy conducted in the legislative assemblies on a general basis which leaves us strongly in doubt whether or not Austria ever acts in entire

<sup>1</sup> One expects to find press and diplomats drawing conclusions about Austro-German relations from the prominence of the German Kaiser at the Empress Elizabeth's funeral, though nothing more was necessarily implied than the published text of the Triple Alliance would explain; but one hardly expects to find among the causes solemnly enumerated for Italy's entrance into the war in a semi-official history the failure of Franz Josef to return the visit of Humbert in 1882. Luigi Carnovale, *Why Italy entered into the Great War* (Chicago, 1917), pp. 246-247.

harmony with Berlin. We learn constantly that Germany and German policy have aroused grave concern at Vienna or Pesth and conversely that the officials on the Wilhelmstrasse consider the acts of their confrères singularly blundering and inept,<sup>2</sup> while the foreign correspondents and diplomats are genuinely in doubt whether the Austrians understand their own internal conditions or international complications.<sup>3</sup>

Then suddenly we are plunged into the war of 1914 and at once find these conclusions in regard to the previous relations of Austria-Hungary and Germany—apparently well documented and supported by reliable testimony from all sorts of participants and observers—diametrically opposed to the actual relations revealed by the outbreak of the war. Austro-German history as written has been dominated by the memory of 1866, by the jealousy, suspicion, and hatred of Prussia, which it has been supposed was transferred in 1871 to the new empire. Yet such an assumption is definitely negated by the war of 1914. Pan-Germanism required for its preparation so great a length of time and demanded for its adequate execution so perfect a correlation of effort between the two countries; the part of each was so dependent upon the work of the other; each must necessarily be so thoroughly convinced of the other's dependability; and both so entirely staked upon the issue their destiny as nations, that the fundamental fact of their relations must have been for some considerable period that degree of mutual faith which the great scheme, of whose existence we are now thoroughly assured, made so decidedly essential. So far as the Germans were concerned, Austria and Hungary were two essential links in the confederation. Success would be unthinkable without secure reliance on them, because upon their continued co-operation, without coercion or thought of disloyalty, would depend the control of the Balkans which were to be entrusted to them and the all-important access to Turkey and to Asia Minor. Before the Germans could have dared to devote so much effort to a scheme upon whose success they risked so much, they must have been convinced beyond a

<sup>2</sup> This is the commonest conclusion. See Fullerton, *Problems of Power* (1915), pp. 201, 244, 326, 335. Even so evident an official apologist as Charmatz complains on the appointment of Aehrenthal of "eine empfindliche Schädigung" "durch die laxen Führung der äusseren Politik." *Geschichte der Auswärtigen Politik Oesterreichs*, II. 131, 132.

<sup>3</sup> "The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy deserves perhaps to head the list of States whose policy has been guided by fundamental ignorance of the foreign questions most nearly affecting them." Steed, *Hapsburg Monarchy* (London, 1913), p. 280. The author was for a long time correspondent of the *Times* at Vienna and is now foreign editor of that newspaper.



shadow of doubt of the loyalty and dependability of the Hapsburg monarch and of his ability to direct and control the elements apparently hostile to them in his vast domains. Those who still cling despite the present war to the older view, of the continuity of the legacy of 1866, take refuge in the implication that Austria was less interested in the new policy than Germany; was dragged into it unwillingly; and is not yet conscious that it is on the whole contrary to her political and economic interests.<sup>4</sup> They see the Monarchy dominated by Germany despite the monarch or see Austrian and Hungarian statesmen anxiously trying to awaken their aged and senile leader from his fatuous delusion.<sup>5</sup> This is plain assumption, not evidence, and rests upon the idea that the past hatreds must have continued to influence policy. It is inconsistent with the assumption, evidentially perhaps no better but from the point of fact immensely stronger, that the present war would have been for Germany an act of the wildest folly so long as any possible doubt remained as to the sureness of Austrian co-operation. Nor could such doubt be dissipated except by the knowledge that the more important elements in Austria and in Hungary were conscious of direct and immediate advantages to accrue to Austria-Hungary, commensurate with the effort which the execution of the plan would involve. To have undertaken so extensive a war, as this was almost certain to be, with a corpse around Germany's neck;<sup>6</sup> with the only ally of any strength or capacity seditious and disloyal; lacking, too, in any conviction of the value of the effort to her, would have made the beginning of such an aggressive war the product of plain lunacy and would render its continuance problematical, if not impossible. The continuance of the war alone must negative such an assumption until we are confronted with the most positive evidence, beyond the ability of press bureaux or imaginative correspondents to fabricate.

<sup>4</sup> Such was the text of most of those foreigners who treated of Pan-Germanism at all. The ablest of these is André Chéradame, whose numerous books had some influence on certain sections of French opinion before the war. His summary of his contentions in his more elaborate treatises is *L'Allemagne, la France, et la Question d'Autriche* (Paris, 1902).

<sup>5</sup> This is the common ante-bellum implication of the numerous statements that the bond between Austrian and German politics was close. It does not usually imply or connote the existence of Pan-Germanism. So Sosnosky writes in the *Contemporary Review*, CVI. 222, of the "timid, anxious, feeble policy which the Monarchy had pursued since Andrassy". So Chéradame: "sans doute, les 'poussées' de Germanisme ont déterminé la politique vacillante de François Joseph". *L'Allemagne, la France, et la Question d'Autriche*, p. 123.

<sup>6</sup> A remark concerning Austria credited by English sources to the German ambassador as he was leaving London in 1914.

Pan-Germanism is as fundamentally advantageous to Austrian interests as to German. Indeed, it far more directly conforms to the traditional policies and ambitions of the former than to those of the latter. The Hapsburg problem has been singularly difficult and a solution has been so long imperative that its postponement has almost ceased to terrify Austrian statesmen. The dissolution of the Monarchy has been for so many generations predicted and proclaimed that they have almost come to feel that a state of suspended animation is the only possible condition of continued existence.<sup>7</sup> On the one hand, Austria has found the gravest danger from the steady growth of Russia in men and economic resources, partly because of the contiguity of Russian territory, partly because of Russian ambition to achieve Constantinople and a preponderant influence in the Balkans. Austria and Hungary too need to open the windows and to acquire dependable access to the ocean highways, but unfortunately for Austria, the only possible solutions thwart the traditional policies of Russia and of Italy. Then, the singularly numerous and discordant congeries of races of which the Monarchy is composed have long found it difficult to exist together and thus far impossible to get along without each other. It has therefore seemed essential to the Hapsburg rulers that the Monarchy should become something decisively more, if it was to offset the powerful influences attempting to make it something considerably less. Pan-Germanism seemed better fitted than other plans to cope with the ambitions of Russia along the Danube and the Straits and with the desires of Italy to overrun the western Balkans and turn the Adriatic into an Italian lake. It also promised to provide some permanent solution of racial antagonism within, by the inclusion of the Monarchy in the larger unity of the Pan-Germanic confederation.

The true evidential difficulty however lies not in the fact that this conclusion is based upon inference or deduction rather than upon documentary evidence concerning the prime factors which it involves, nor that it contravenes an older view which is sustained by evidence. The truth is that the older view was also based on inference and assumption. Strictly speaking, what has too frequently been called evidence is nothing better than testimony. We have a considerable number of printed statements, written or spoken by men who may have known the truth, but we have no proof at all that they saw fit to tell us any of it.<sup>8</sup> The first-hand direct infor-

<sup>7</sup> Best exemplified by the policies and speeches of Taaffe.

<sup>8</sup> Obviously, von Bülow, *Imperial Germany*; zu Reventlow, *Deutschland's Auswärtige Politik*; Zimmermann, *Geschichte der Deutschen Kolonialpolitik*. So Sir Horace Rumbold's various volumes.

mation from participants is not necessarily reliable testimony. The witness may have intentionally deceived us. We have a much larger number of books written by men who were quite anxious to tell the truth, but who were not necessarily aware of what the truth was.<sup>9</sup> Such books are merely printed testimony, and as information are perhaps no better than hearsay. There are, too, the reminiscences and personal experiences, in some number, of people on the fringe of diplomatic life.<sup>10</sup> There is a grave doubt whether they knew anything to tell. It has been too much the habit to write the history of Austrian foreign policy as if it were the independent work of ministers responsible to a parliamentary majority in the British sense, bound therefore to present as much truth as possible to it, and whose statements could be accepted precisely because they were those of responsible officials. This was to forget that Austria did not possess parliamentary government in any proper sense. Indeed the difficulty of a study of Austro-German relations lies not in the dearth of material, but in an entire lack of any material since 1890 which can be accepted as valid evidence of the real facts we wish to establish. The interest shown in the subject by students, trained in scientific method, competent to handle its complexities with impartiality and disinterest, has been small.<sup>11</sup> The best historical work, if such it can be called, has been done by diplomats, lawyers, professional agitators,<sup>12</sup> newspaper correspondents,<sup>13</sup> nearly

<sup>9</sup> The real indictment of the whole ante-bellum literature of Austro-German history is its failure to treat Pan-Germanism as an organic part of German policy. The majority ignore it altogether.

<sup>10</sup> *Seven Years in Vienna, a Record of Intrigue* (Boston, 1917), very decidedly belongs in this category.

<sup>11</sup> With Friedjung's books and articles, Wertheimer's *Andrássy*, Fournier's *Wie wir zu Bosnien kamen* (Vienna, 1909), S. Goriainov, *Bosfor i Dardanely* (1907; Fr. tr., *Le Bosphore et les Dardanelles*, 1910), our list ends. Yet even these are not free from the suspicion of official influence.

<sup>12</sup> There is a voluminous literature by the Czechs, the Serbians, the Rumanians, and the Slavs generally, in French, German, and English, most of which is so obviously prejudiced as to be useless even for local history. See, however, J. Spalaikovitich, *La Bosnie et l'Herzégovine: Étude d'Histoire Diplomatique de Droit International* (Paris, 1899); A. Stead, *Servia by the Servians* (London, 1909); I. F. Voïnov, *La Question Macédonienne et les Réformes en Turquie* (Paris, 1905); V. Mantegazza, *L'Altra Sponda: Italia e Austria nell' Adriatico* (Milan, 1905).

<sup>13</sup> It is surprising to note how largely the literature on recent Austrian history in English is the work of newspaper correspondents. Dr. E. J. Dillon is almost as well known as de Blowitz used to be. Fullerton and Steed were *Times* correspondents at Vienna; Chéradame of various Parisian reviews; Schierbrand represented the American Associated Press in various capitals; as did H. A. Gibbons. Norman Angell was long a correspondent at Paris; Bérard, a per-

all of whom have been vehemently anxious to present some particular view of it as true. There are no countries in the world where more varieties of ideas have sought verisimilitude from quasi-historical investigation. Scarcely any phase of German history and certainly none of Austrian or Hungarian diplomacy or history but has been since 1866 and is still the subject of the most acrimonious controversy in those countries and in the outside world. The majority of books have been written as propaganda, if not for consumption in Austria-Hungary or Germany then for perusal in some other country.<sup>14</sup> In no countries has the influence of the state and its policies upon the writing of history been so consciously extended, so determined, and so successfully concealed.<sup>15</sup> Evidence has probably been manufactured for immediate consumption ever since the printing press began to be used, but certainly no issue has ever been treated by any state with such elaboration and continued thought as Austro-German relations.

Unfortunately, too, the testimony and events which we must evaluate, and from which we must exclude prejudiced material, are themselves to be evaluated on the basis of independent conclusions about fundamental factors whose correctness the author assumes rather than proves. The truth is that the few bare facts definitely ascertained, when read by themselves, prove too little; read in the light of preconceived conclusions they prove too much. The variety of opinions therefore on Austro-German relations, as on

sonal friend of Delcassé, was correspondent of the *Revue de Paris*. Interesting as many of the books written by these men are, they cannot be regarded as the result of historical study, and frequently betray ignorance of vitally important facts about past history and about the history of other countries. Diplomatic history is a tangled web of which only a fraction is visible in the policy of any one country, and which must be viewed as a whole with perspective and with an objective purpose if anything better is to result than the casual testimony of an intelligent bystander. Editors, like Villari, Tardieu, and Harden, attain something more like detachment, but are apt to be unduly influenced by their own environment and by the immediate political situation. Steed's *Hapsburg Monarchy* is an admirable and carefully written book which has won itself a place with serious students.

<sup>14</sup>The numerous and otherwise excellent books of Chéradame all have a definite subjective purpose and usually were written to expound some particular phase of policy desirable for France, rather than merely to analyze the situation in an objective way. So too the works of R. W. Seton-Watson have in some ways the aspect of a cautious, subtle, but definite championship of the cause of the Southern Slavs.

<sup>15</sup>Excellent statements of the official view of Austrian history and of relations with Germany as with other powers are to be found in the small volumes by R. Charnatz, *Geschichte der Auswärtigen Politik Oesterreichs* (Leipzig, 1909); *Deutsch-Oesterreichische Politik* (*ibid.*, 1907).

Austro-Hungarian foreign policy, is due simply enough to the variety of conclusions about Austrian, Hungarian, and German history, about parliamentary, administrative, local, economic, national, racial controversies, in the light of which the bare skeleton of diplomatic material is interpreted and from which it at once, like a chameleon, borrows color and form. Definite or indefinite notions in regard to the relative strength of Austria and Hungary, the willingness of the Czechs to sacrifice Austrian international interests to achieve something more of autonomy, the comparative influence of the emperor and his statesmen, the influence over him of the German Kaiser, the ability of the Magyars to dictate to Austria—these are the premises upon which most conclusions regarding Austro-German relations are really based.

It is idle for us to cavil at the use of conclusions reached by inference and deduction rather than established by direct and unimpeachable evidence, because, unfortunately, we shall probably never have direct evidence for the facts and relationships of the greatest importance. Metternich, Bismarck, and others less illustrious have called our attention to the fact that no direct first-hand testimony and no written evidence will ever be available regarding the conversations and agreements upon which the most significant decisions of the nineteenth century probably rested. The sovereigns met in person so that there might be no witnesses, no documents, no record of what was said. The archives will therefore yield nothing, nor will the papers of the statesmen nearest the monarchs give us anything better than their own guesswork and surmise. Our problem is really to do what we can to supply this deficiency of evidence by some inference or deduction, which we must admit in advance cannot be documented, but which will at least aid us to evaluate the testimony and to separate, however roughly or imperfectly, the material prepared to deceive us from that which reflects some ray of the truth.

We must start then from the war of 1914 and the conclusion that the nature of the aggressive plan out of which it grew involved for some years a degree of co-operation between Austria-Hungary and Germany of the closest description. We shall then interpret Austro-German relations in the light of this offensive and defensive agreement as soon as its existence can be demonstrated. The events consistent with it will afford us some light upon its character and extent. Those inconsistent with it we must perforce treat as the work of men unaware of its existence or as the result of intentional deception. In attempting to assign a date for the beginning

of this close co-operation, we are assisted by a fairly definite knowledge that the earlier stage of the relations from 1871 ended between 1887 and 1889.

The paramount fact in Austrian policy became in 1871 a close alliance with Germany, based upon Austrian fear of Russia, because of the enmity revealed by the Crimean War, by the neutrality of Russia in 1866, and by the aggressive schemes suspected of her after 1870 which could be furthered only at Austria's expense. The Franco-Prussian War had left France for the moment too weak and disorganized to afford Austria any real assistance; Great Britain was not dependable, and only an alliance with Germany could thwart the schemes of Russia in the Balkans and neutralize her weight in the scale until France should recover. For this aid Austria was forced to pay by a support of German policy. This was based upon the necessity of isolating France in Europe so as to make impossible an assault upon the new German Empire before it should have achieved administrative and economic cohesion. This, too, involved an agreement with Russia, which alone was able and willing to aid France and cripple Germany. An understanding therefore with Russia on behalf of Austria became essential for Germany, and one between Germany and Austria against France no less important in case the actual attack should take place and Russia should intervene in favor of France, for fear lest she might this time be too greatly weakened. The interests of each of the three therefore lay principally in preventing action by the other two, and this would continue to be the immediate basis of policy so long as Russian ambition persisted, and so long as there was danger of either an attack by Germany upon France or one by France upon Germany.

Aggression therefore against Russia in the Balkans by Austria was unthinkable so long as German assistance was foreclosed by the necessity of remaining free to deal with a France bent upon revenge. Germany, too, must protest an entire lack of interest in Balkan and Turkish problems, to be able to convince Russia that she would assist her should Austria attempt to overturn the *status quo* along the Danube.<sup>16</sup> Austria therefore must forbear to execute the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin to which Russia was clearly hostile despite the agreement at Reichstadt. This too coincided with the domestic policies required by the strong Slav and Magyar parties in Austria and Hungary, who were anxious on the one hand to limit

<sup>16</sup> See Herbert von Bismarck's statement to Crispi of what his father said to the tsar in 1888. Crispi, *Memoirs*, II. 346. "The Triple Alliance has no interest in dragging Turkey within its orbit. . . . It would be perfectly useless."



German influence and on the other to prevent the acquisition of further Slav territory. 1887 and 1888, however, with the defeat of the Jingo and Boulangist agitation in France saw the adoption of a defensive policy, a reduction of the army, and the accession to power of statesmen from whom Germany had little to fear. Certainly in 1889, if not a year earlier with the publication of the Dual Alliance, the Wilhelmstrasse concluded that the danger of attack from France was no better than a remote possibility.<sup>17</sup>

In attempting to assign some moment when the prosecution of the Pan-Germanic scheme became practical politics or when it first began to dominate the secret policies of both Austria and Germany, we shall much promote the inquiry by defining what we mean by Pan-Germanism. We shall imply a confederation of states protecting an all-rail highway to the Far East and the Persian Gulf against the land-power of Russia on the one hand and against the sea-power of England on the other. In this bond the countries of the confederation would find the only definitive defense against the future physical growth of Russia and the only possible basis of an aggressive contest with the existing British sea-power. The essential preliminaries would be the railroad from Constantinople to the Persian Gulf, the control of the Balkans by Austria, the control of the Baltic and the North Sea by a new German fleet. Is it not therefore remarkable that in 1888 the first application should have been made for the construction of the Bagdad Railway, that in 1889 Wilhelm II. should have visited Constantinople, from which moment German influence in Turkey has commonly been dated, that in 1890 the Anglo-German agreement should have ceded to Germany Heligoland, its present fleet base in the North Sea? In 1890, furthermore, Germany declined to renew the Reinsurance Agreement with Russia and no less an event occurred than the resignation of Bismarck. There came also a demand from the Kaiser in the Reichstag for a decided increase in the army. In the light of what we know now these events are scarcely coincidences. It seems reasonable and safe to infer that they were the result of the adoption of the policy (perhaps then in its first stage) of what we now call Pan-Germanism. They imply precisely that complete harmony of relationship, that mutual confidence by Germany and Austria-Hungary in each other's dependability, which is precisely what we are most interested to establish. But the immediate execution of

<sup>17</sup> The importance however attached to the possibility of war in 1888 is revealed by Crispien's statements of Bismarck's account of Germany's preparations. *Memoirs*, II. 412.



a new policy upon the disappearance of the old fear of France would seem to show that the agreements upon which it rested must have been the work of the years preceding.<sup>18</sup>

The relation of Bismarck to Pan-Germanism and the real reasons for his resignation are questions of the utmost importance. If this great change in German policy took place at this time, it seems scarcely probable that he was not cognizant of it and had not some share in it. That his resignation was entirely without relation to it seems more unlikely, and that the scheme itself was hatched and adopted without consulting him, most improbable. Still less plausible is the official explanation so carefully prepared at the time in which so much was made of the Kaiser's wilfulness and Bismarck's temper.<sup>19</sup> Taking his earlier policy by and large, and reading the new scheme in the light of it, it seems probable that he objected not so much to Pan-Germanism itself, its objects and purposes, as to an immediate attempt to execute it, involving a radical change in the defensive character of German alliances and dispositions—on the ground that the Empire was not yet sufficiently developed industrially, nor yet secure enough internationally to risk such an aggressive policy. Austrian problems, too, he may have objected, were not yet sufficiently well solved, nor the attitude of Slavs and Magyars well enough established, to make sure that the emperor could speak for his people and insure their co-operation. The progress toward Pan-Germanism must be slow, and such direct steps as were being undertaken would be inexpedient perhaps for a generation. These are, to be sure, assumptions, but unfortunately we shall probably always in this matter be forced to check the direct testimony of those who did not really know the facts in the light of just such assumptions.

Pan-Germanism also explains the refusal to renew the Reinsurance Agreement, just as the quarrel over Pan-Germanism between Bismarck and the Kaiser will explain Bismarck's promise to renew it and Caprivi's immediate refusal to do so. The agreement did not bind Russia in the very matter now of most consequence, an

<sup>18</sup> Bismarck said to the Duke of Genoa in 1883: "Austria had completely abandoned her ancient policy of hostility against Germany and Italy alike, a policy which had greatly weakened the House of Hapsburg in the past. Germany, therefore, now found herself on terms of perfect intimacy with the neighboring Empire." Crispi, *Memoirs*, II. 158.

<sup>19</sup> The official case is excellently stated by A. Debidour, *Histoire Diplomatique de l'Europe depuis le Congrès de Berlin jusqu'à nos Jours* (Paris, 1917), I. 139-146. Two further confirmatory statements, of those already familiar to students, are in Crispi, *Memoirs*, II. 427-434; and from Russian archives, by Goriainov, in the last number of the *American Historical Review*, XXIII. 343.

attack by Germany upon France, a necessary step in the execution of Pan-Germanism. It also underwrote Russia's prior claim to Constantinople and the domination of the eastern Balkans.<sup>20</sup> Aimed primarily at Great Britain, it also excluded Austria. Pan-Germanism however proposed to extend Austrian control over the whole of the Balkans and to appropriate Constantinople and Turkey, to say nothing of Asia Minor, for Germany herself. Bismarck in all probability had quietly informed the Austrians of the Reinsurance Treaty, just as he had shown the Russians, when the treaty was signed, the text of the Dual Alliance with Austria. The argument against secrecy is weak. Moreover, should Russia and France then conclude an alliance, it would not be dangerous either to Germany or to Austria, because it had been abundantly clear as early as 1876 that Russia proposed to aid France directly in the field in case of an attack by Germany. No treaty could strengthen Russian resolve and no German argument had been able to weaken it. The Reinsurance Agreement therefore was not renewed, less because secret from Austria and therefore a breach of the Dual Alliance, than because unnecessary after the events of 1888 and 1889.

The Pan-Germanist movement in Austria and the Pan-Germanist literature in Germany cannot be accepted as evidence of the true character of Austrian policies or of German intentions, still less of the real relationship between the two countries.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, the Pan-Germanists in Austria have been no better than a racial group created in imitation of the other nationalist groups in order to defend the racial interests of Germans threatened by the Slavophile policies of the ministers.<sup>22</sup> Their work has been mainly obstruction in the legislative bodies and agitation outside, at elections, of a char-

<sup>20</sup> Crispi has revealed an attempted agreement on the Near East between Austria, Italy, and Great Britain in 1887, which was of course directed against Russia. *Memoirs*, II. 189.

<sup>21</sup> G. Weil, *Le Pangermanisme en Autriche* (Paris, 1904, second ed. 1914), seems to have demonstrated these statements by figures collected by other students and by himself. Chéradame takes very decidedly the opposite view and therefore concludes Pan-Germanism contrary to Austrian interests, and hence decides that Austria cannot be a reliable ally of Germany. *L'Allemagne, la France, et la Question d'Autriche*, pp. 140 ff.

<sup>22</sup> The date of the Pan-Germanist movement in Austria, M. Chéradame places as early as 1877; *op. cit.*, p. 140. See however internal evidence in S. von Madeyski, *Die Deutsche Staatssprache oder Oesterreich ein Deutscher Staat* (Vienna, 1884); and H. Hainisch, *Die Zukunft der Deutsch-Oesterreicher* (Vienna, 1892). The difficulty is to find the date when the nationalist agitation begun by Schönerer expanded into something larger. We must again beware of supposing that all German Pan-Germanists had credentials from the Wilhelmstrasse, and that their relations with him and others gave his work semi-official sanction.

acter which can hardly have found approval at Vienna or at Berlin. Its leaders, Schönerer, Wolf, Iro, were too indiscreet, blatant, and irrational to be trusted with real secrets. Of the coldness and lack of sympathy in Berlin for their schemes they have bitterly complained. Their propaganda shrieks for the annexation of the German provinces of Austria to Germany itself, thus freeing those Germans from the control of the Slavs. They have also plunged into the anti-Semitic agitation and launched a radical Protestant crusade under the slogan "Los von Rom". Possibly their activities may have been a part of the elaborate policy of deception practised by both the Austrian and the German governments, but it seems more likely that the real work of spreading German propaganda in Austria was done in other ways by other agencies, more quietly and more effectively. The avowed Pan-Germanists in Austria did not in forty years succeed in developing real strength or influence.

The most difficult fact to explain of those happenings whose verity is beyond denial is the apparent pursuance by Austro-Hungarian foreign ministers of anti-German policies. The majority of the speeches delivered in the legislative assemblies, the undoubtedly sincere professions of the various racial groups, are certainly hostile to Pan-Germanism or to any such close relationship between the two states as it necessarily demands. Yet it is not so difficult to harmonize this mass of material with Pan-Germanism, the war, and this extremely close relationship, without resorting to the claim that Austria has been cozened, cheated, coerced, and dominated contrary to her desires and interests by Germany. She was too indispensable to the war and too able to block its execution by mere inertia ever to be subordinate in any real sense. As Bismarck saw, no ally who was indispensable could ever be a subordinate. "From the moment when the conviction is established in Vienna that the bridge between Germany and Russia is broken down, Austria will assume a different attitude toward the German Empire, and Germany will run the risk of becoming in a sense dependent upon Austria."<sup>23</sup> Only Austria's willing co-operation could suffice and that could continue only so long as the Austrian statesmen were satisfied that she had been accorded unstinted recognition of equality as an ally. This again is inference, but it raises a presumption which only definite evidence can alter.

The existence of Pan-Germanism must on no account be suspected by the other European powers. The public relations of

<sup>23</sup> Hofmann, I. 314. January 28, 1891. See *id.*, II. 6. January 24, 1892.

Austria-Hungary and Germany must therefore be dictated by the imperative necessity of concealing the existence and extent of the offensive and defensive alliance between them. They must act and speak as if no relationship existed. To confess it would give an international signal of the existence of Pan-Germanism, warn other governments of the intended preparations, and effectually forestall the execution of any such elaborate plan. France, Russia, and Great Britain would certainly believe that Germany would not dare start so ambitious a movement without support. Hence so long as a genuine doubt of the loyalty of Austria and of the closeness of the bond with Germany could be preserved in their minds, the concealment of the great scheme would be complete and the preparations might go forward securely. The more so because Germany must take the important steps. She alone could assail France, she alone must contest the seas with England, and she was certain to receive the first attack from Russia. Nor did the internal political conditions in Austria make similarly elaborate preparations feasible without the risk of revealing the scheme itself. It was therefore a foregone conclusion that the public relations of Germany and Austria must be built upon the assumed legacy of suspicion and hatred bequeathed by the rivalry of the Metternich system and the war of 1866. At international crises, moreover, it might be possible by a certain coolness and aloofness of attitude to increase the verisimilitude of this effect. There was some suspicion that at Algeciras Austrian support of the German contentions was lukewarm and public opinion in Austria hostile. This was useful to the two and not at all dangerous. It was obvious from the first that they could not prevail against Great Britain and France on the Moroccan question, even if they stood together. The only chance of success lay in Germany's ability to intimidate the new Entente or to play upon the mutual suspicions of its members. The open adhesion of Austria could not turn the tide if Germany should fail. In fact, a stand sufficiently united and determined to put pressure upon their opponents would promptly reveal to the European states the extent of the alliance between the two and, what was perhaps quite as undesirable, would make it known to the representative bodies at home. They would expose their hand without the chance of a commensurable gain. The value of this policy was at once apparent in 1908 when the initial doubt as to whether Germany would support the annexations was the one thing which delayed the concerted action of the powers until really too late.

Nor must the truth about Pan-Germanism and the close alliance

with Germany be suspected by the Czechs and other Slav peoples in Austria. They were already too much afraid of German domination in Austria, too anxious to nullify it, to permit them to view with anything but extreme apprehension the support of German Austria by the might of Germany itself, and the propagation of a scheme almost certain in its ultimate outcome to rob them of such influence upon Austrian policy as they already possessed. The public foreign policy of Austria must therefore be so conducted as to disarm their suspicions and not to weaken and disrupt the state by an increase of the existing antagonism, at the very time when as considerable an increase of its unity and strength was essential as might be attained. Ostensibly Austria must be anti-German. Foreign ministers in the legislative bodies must continually declare such policies as would be consistent with this general position, and, to be politically valuable in parliamentary debates, they must be ignorant of the real truth. Otherwise, in a moment of indiscretion or passion, they might blurt out something which could never be retracted or disowned. The emperor must therefore be his own foreign minister.<sup>24</sup> The real negotiations of importance he must conduct in person. Occasionally he might find some man like Aehrenthal intelligent and trustworthy enough to be told at least a portion of the truth, but even he should never know the full extent of the scheme.

Still less must the truth be suspected by the Magyars and by the Southern Slavs. The Magyars were already outnumbered and any addition to the Slav population of Hungary would invite vehement opposition because of its results upon local politics and their own political hegemony. Inasmuch as Slav territory added to the Monarchy must be joined to Hungary (save along the Adriatic), Austrian aggression in the Balkans such as Pan-Germanism predicated must be conducted with the utmost secrecy and finesse. The Magyars no less than the Powers must be confronted with a *fait accompli*. So too the Southern Slavs. Their hopes for autonomy or independence would find slight chance of realization, as they well knew, if the Monarchy should embark upon a scheme of expansion in the Balkans. That would necessarily tighten administrative control of the adjacent provinces both for military and for diplomatic reasons.

The autocratic and non-parliamentary character of the Austro-Hungarian constitution made such concealment simple. Foreign affairs were already the prerogative of the monarch nor was there

<sup>24</sup> Bismarck declared Franz Josef the real link binding Austria to Germany. *Bismarck, the Man and the Statesman*, II. 280. See also Steed, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, p. 208.

a firm tradition that the minister would necessarily be responsible for policy. Certainly there was no imperative need for communicating the truth to any legislative body, because the monarch was not politically responsible for his policy to any of the various chambers. The group system in all these houses intensified the racial hostility and produced a general instability and lack of harmony which made all groups prefer to leave many important questions to the monarch, rather than to risk a decision upon them at the hands of the other racial parties. The foreign ministers accordingly should serve the parliamentary needs of the local situation. Both the chambers and the ministers might be depended upon to produce that precise anti-German policy and sentiment most useful in the international situation. We see, therefore, in most histories, exactly what we were meant to see, an Austria-Hungary by no means sure to act in concert with Germany; ministers whose speeches and actions constantly aroused grave resentment in Berlin and who themselves not infrequently give vent to genuine expressions of displeasure in regard to German policies; an Austrian diplomacy sometimes blundering, inept, the result of the failure to understand internal conditions in both Austria and Hungary and in particular the result of an entire failure to appreciate correctly the great forces in Europe. Best of all, this camouflage would be the work of perfectly sincere and entirely honest men, who would do it for reasons of their own, as all Europe could discover and demonstrate. If such was Austrian policy, if such were Austrian ministers, surely Austria was scarcely a dangerous member of the European family, not at all likely to be a dependable ally of Germany. Above all, if such were Austrian interests and sentiments, she was not in the least likely to be a dependable ally in the execution of Pan-Germanism.

Any discussion of Austro-German relations since 1890 other than a narrative of this elaborate camouflage as it now seems to us, involves a consideration of the whole web of European diplomacy in relation to the present war. While so large a subject can not be treated in an article of this length, it may be useful to treat a few incidents of it in the light of the premises just laid down. The diplomatic field was divided. The two powers should not act together, still less negotiate in concert, and should never openly support each other unless very serious interests demanded it. The Triple Alliance, already made public, would explain a considerable cousinly interest, but German policy must be one thing and Austrian policy must very decidedly be another. Germany should accord-



ingly deal, in the interests of both, with the general foreign policy in Europe, and should invariably take the aggressive stand, if one must be taken. In such cases it should be Austria's duty to hang back and raise objections. The physical location of Germany, moreover, made her naturally the power to negotiate with Great Britain, France, and Spain, and to deal with African and colonial problems. She, too, on account of the wars of 1866 and 1870, had direct treaty relations with Italy which made simple her participation in Italian affairs as an offset to the hostility Italy still felt to Austria. Austrian diplomacy should limit itself to the affairs of Russia, Turkey, and the Balkans, partly because past Austrian ambitions and obvious primary interests were such as to justify an explanation, on Austrian grounds alone, of that precise type of aggression or peaceful penetration most useful to the two conspirators. The Treaty of Berlin, moreover, had provided Austria, whether or not with prevision, with a bundle of treaty rights and possibilities which would give color to the exact measures to be undertaken in the Balkans. Turkey, however, Germany must control and direct. Austrian interests in Constantinople were too considerable to make it possible to suppose that Russia or Great Britain would see an extension of direct Austrian influence at the Porte without the gravest apprehension. So long, too, as any suspicion could be kept alive of the extent of the alliance between Austria and Germany, German control of Constantinople would rouse no particular apprehension.

Austria had therefore certain very obvious and important tasks to perform. She must allay the suspicions of the Slavs in her own domains and win their allegiance to the Monarchy. She must allay the suspicion of Italy, roused already by the events of 1878 and 1879, and hold Italy to the Triple Alliance, at any rate preventing a real entente or alliance between Italy and Great Britain or France. Russia, if possible, must be conciliated, her suspicions disarmed, and she must be won away from the alliance signed with France in 1892 and certainly her suspicions of Great Britain kept active. To increase Austrian territory and influence in the Balkans without antagonizing these interests was the true task. Somehow or other their consent must be won little by little to the execution of the Treaty of Berlin, to the establishment in Bulgaria of the Austrian house, and to the establishment of an *entente cordiale* with Rumania. For this reason in 1897 a verbal agreement was made with the Italians to recede from their territorial pretensions in Albania and to guarantee Albanian autonomy. This was confirmed in writ-



ing in 1899 and 1900, confirmed again in 1905 and 1906, and was operative still in 1912 and 1913. At the same time here and there the Italians were allowed privileges and concessions in return for certain gains and changes which the Austrians felt to be indispensable.

Not later than 1896 the existence of the Franco-Russian treaty was suspected at Berlin and Vienna and, anxious to ascertain its extent, the Austrian emperor visited St. Petersburg in August, 1896, and there began the combination which was to continue until 1908, to break that alliance if possible, and if so much might not be had, to secure Russian consent to the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina. The tsar promptly countered with a visit to Paris, at which the existence of the Franco-Russian defensive alliance was practically admitted. Not until 1902 was the question again actively urged, this time in the guise of necessary reforms in Macedonia. Presently a meeting of the emperors produced both the February and the Mürzsteg programmes.<sup>25</sup> The fear in Paris and London was great that the very reasonable reforms announced portended a secret agreement to divide the Balkans between Austria and Russia and exclude British and French influence altogether. Naturally the French feared lest such a secret agreement might weaken their own alliance with Russia. The British accordingly—presently, as a result of the Anglo-French agreement of April, 1904, backed by the French—insisted that the reforms in Macedonia should be internationalized. They meant, of course, that they could not accept any such exclusion from the Balkans as the Austro-Russian agreement tacitly implied, and that they must insist upon public recognition both of their interests and of those of France in the Near East. The new arrangement changed the general understanding reached at Berlin in 1878, that all the powers were interested in the Balkan settlement. Both the Austrians and the Russians felt it better to yield, and accordingly submitted both the arrangements and their execution for consideration and action by the powers as a whole.

The outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War promptly caused very great and continued activity by the British and the French in the Balkans to prevent Austria from utilizing Russia's preoccupation by annexing the long promised provinces and perhaps overrunning the Balkans as a whole. No doubt this is the real explanation of Goluchowski's inactivity. The Kaiser, as we now know, had somewhat earlier tried to win the tsar to an *entente* between France,

<sup>25</sup> In 1883 Bismarck suggested something like the Mürzsteg Programme to the Russian ambassador to Berlin. Goriainov, in *American Historical Review*, XXIII. 327.

Russia, and Germany, by what are now called the Willy-Nicky telegrams, whose existence was revealed by the Russian revolutionists. The visit to Tangier, the conference of Algeciras, the restlessness of Italy, and the persistent pressure of Great Britain and France in the Balkans, occupied the international concert until 1907, when the battle royal was fought with a vengeance. In the spring a proposal was made by Austria to Russia for an *entente à quatre* on the Near East by Germany, Austria, Russia, and France.<sup>26</sup> The mutual concessions were decidedly favorable to Russia and France, although the Central Powers by no means forgot themselves, for the prime object was not so much to settle the quarrel as to isolate Great Britain and Italy. This agreement would have nullified the Anglo-French agreement and also the Triple Alliance, would have given Austria control of the Adriatic, and have made possible an assault by Germany upon England. The Russians, however, declined the arrangement. They presently came to terms with the British about Persia and India. The diplomatic defeat of Austria was complete. Its endeavor to draw Russia from its allegiance had failed and the suspicions of Italy were as active as ever. It was decided at Berlin and Vienna to test at once the extent of the mutual agreement between the Russians, the British, and the French by presenting them with a new *fait accompli* in the Balkans. The concession for a railroad through Novibazar announced in January, 1908, was the first step, and that bomb having been successfully exploded, the annexations followed in October. The two successfully demonstrated the fact that the Anglo-Russian agreement did not extend to armed support of Russia in the Balkans. Obviously, too, none of them had promised armed assistance to Italy, who was compelled to swallow her disgust at so radical a change along the Adriatic.<sup>27</sup>

But there seems to have been little doubt in London, Paris, or St. Petersburg, after the annexations, of the existence of Pan-Germanism and of the extent of the offensive and defensive alliance between Germany and Austria which it portended.<sup>28</sup> Certainly the close relationship between the Wilhelmstrasse and the Ballplatz was no longer in doubt, and hereafter became a premise of the diplomacy of the Triple Entente. They were clear that Austria never would have undertaken the annexations and certainly would never have executed them by so decided a *volte-face* had not the alliance with

<sup>26</sup> Steed, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, p. 268.

<sup>27</sup> Italy printed mobilization orders against Austria which were afterwards redated and used for the Tripolitan war. Sosnosky in *Contemporary Review*, CVI. 218.

<sup>28</sup> See the leading article in the *London Times* for August 30, 1909.

Germany been of unlimited extent and of long standing. Local politics in Austria-Hungary continued to prevent the monarchy from formulating publicly a policy widely different from that already pursued, and for some time we continue to have speeches and statements apparently anti-German, but the deception had become transparent. The promptitude of support and the decided and unquestioned harmony between the two countries was such that in 1914 no diplomat or statesman doubted that the demands presented to Serbia by Austria had the complete approval of Germany in advance and made clear the intention of both countries to precipitate a European war.

ROLAND G. USHER.

## NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

### PRIVATE JURISDICTION IN ENGLAND:<sup>1</sup> A THEORETICAL RECONSTRUCTION

THE discussion of private jurisdiction in England has always suffered from a peculiar dislocation of the connection between general principles and particular facts. No matter how clearly any scholar has seen and stated the larger distinctions which mark off one kind of private jurisdiction from another, when he begins to consider special cases these distinctions seem to be more or less completely forgotten. The confusion, which undoubtedly exists in the surface appearance of the facts, becomes a confusion of ideas and language which is a good deal more real. It is impossible that our knowledge of the subject should be materially advanced until these distinctions are put in such form that they can be consistently applied to the mixture of facts which we must study. It is only then that we can hope to discover the method and character of the mixture and the reasons for it.

It is not necessary to distinguish here again the three kinds of private jurisdiction from one another and to restate the characteristics of each. It has been done several times and satisfactorily. An especially good statement is that by Professor Vinogradoff in *The Growth of the Manor* (pp. 362-365) because it describes each jurisdiction in its relation to the manor but without confusion. It should be noticed that the statement is not historical, but as it were a cross-section at some given date, and a date necessarily somewhat late in feudal history, but it is I think accurate in all descriptive particulars. A briefer statement may be found in Maitland, *Select Pleas in Manorial Courts* (p. xvi) but the discussion which follows is less satisfactory. In Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw's *Leet Jurisdiction in England* (p. 76 ff.) the distinctions are clearly stated and I believe they are accurately applied throughout the book, wherever there is occasion, but the accompanying historical statements must be understood only of times later than the thirteenth century. Inci-

<sup>1</sup> The following suggestions are based upon a study of the subject during several years in my historical seminary and upon the collection of facts made by Mr. W. O. Ault of Boston University for his doctoral dissertation on private courts in England. The present attempt is rather to set forth a programme of study than to state results that can be considered definitive.

dentially in the following paragraphs, the distinctions will be sufficiently stated for the present purpose.

One of the chief causes of our confusion of mind has been the matter of terminology. It has seemed natural to us to apply certain words to the courts as we find them: feudal, manorial, seigniorial. But these terms have in other connections such broad and differing definitions, but so familiar, or in their use in this subject itself have been so variously applied, that they serve at once to obscure the fundamental distinctions. "Feudal" is a tempting term, but it is too vague and general, and to many minds, and not merely of readers but of writers, it helps to keep up the confusion, fatal to so many things, between the sphere of a serf who is the customary tenant of a manor and that of the vassal who is in strict feudal language a baron, whatever may be his rank or the size of his holding. "Manorial" has led to a still more paralyzing confusion because without doubt every form of private jurisdiction has been much of the time connected with and exercised through the court of a manor. In practice indeed this term has led to the most extensive confusion and to statements that would be astonishing if one did not understand the derangement of ideas responsible for them. The first step out of our difficulties must be the abandonment of our old terminology and the adoption of new designations which we may hope to keep free from confusion, and if possible those that will themselves indicate their meaning.

One cannot hope to get three terms that have never been used, but only terms that carry no history of confusion and which express with some clearness their meaning and limits. Describing the courts in the order of dignity and as if they were entirely independent of one another, the following is what I would propose as a theoretical reconstruction of the system of private courts and jurisdictions of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

I. *Baronial*. Some French scholars use the term vassallic for this jurisdiction and the term would be a good one, if we could keep the fact entirely clear in our minds that serfs were never vassals. The only objection to the term baronial is the existence of the later court baron, but this is not a serious objection because the court baron is the court into which the baronial court declines when feudal jurisdiction proper disappears, in other words when the larger part of the original baronial jurisdiction has been absorbed by the state through the development of the common law courts. This jurisdiction is that which a lord has over his vassals, that is, over his *barones*, the term which was often used for rear vassals

in this connection in England and all feudal states. It was primarily a civil jurisdiction only. It dealt with questions concerning the fiefs held of the lord and the services by which they were held. Disputes concerning inheritance, boundary lines, amount and kind of service, the right to pay homage, those involving questions of possession, title, and *jus*, the transfer of lands, and all questions covered by writs of right sent to the lord and by praecipe writs, are typical cases in these courts. They have also a quasi-criminal side in questions of forfeiture and felony in the feudal sense, but no matter of public criminal offense belongs normally in them. In England the common freeman who does not hold by a military tenure, that is, who is not technically a vassal, gets drawn into these courts, probably because of his political importance in the county courts which makes him unwilling to submit himself in every respect to the manorial (domanial) court, and also very possibly because he holds land of the lord by a tenure into which comparatively slight, or no, economic features enter. Here is, however, a subject for investigation: the reason for the place of the common, non-military free tenant in the baronial court where normally he does not belong.

Of these courts we have very few rolls, probably because they were in rapid decline when the practice of keeping rolls became common. Those we have show that their machinery was not commonly employed for any purpose not their own, but that in occasional instances it was so employed. We get many glimpses of them in charters which must be used to supplement the rolls, especially the charters of the twelfth century when rolls were not kept. The age of their great importance was the twelfth century, and by the middle of the thirteenth their decline was well under way. They never had the importance in England that they had on the Continent, probably because the royal judicial system, the king's local courts and writ and inquest processes, were developed so early, from the date of the Conquest almost, and carried into every locality, evoking from the beginning of Anglo-Norman history many cases from these courts. When the royal system was further developed and strengthened by Henry II. the death-blow was given to this jurisdiction. *Quia Emptores* finished it. It survived in the court baron but as only the shadow of its former self, occupied with the business of common freemen; vassals seem practically to have disappeared as rear vassals. As court baron it is closely associated with the manor (domanial) court, with which very likely from the beginning the baronial court had been in many cases associated.

II. *Franchisal*. The jurisdiction which was created by a franchise. (Maitland, *Domesday and Beyond*, p. 80.) It was asserted for the king in the thirteenth century that this jurisdiction must always go back to the grant of a franchise. Historically this was probably not true, but theoretically it was. It was public jurisdiction in private hands, normally the hundred court, but sometimes the court of only a fraction of the hundred cut out from the rest, when a franchise covered only a manor or some other portion of a hundred. The grants of franchise varied in extent, but taken together they included a rather long list of functions belonging to the state, such for example as the view of the frankpledge, the trial of pleas of the crown, the return of writs and the execution of all royal processes, and the imprisonment and hanging of criminals. Both civil and criminal jurisdiction were included, as far as that of the hundred court extended, and the public officers were shut out as from the Continental immunity. In practice this court was sometimes held by itself, possibly it was usually so held when the whole hundred belonged to the lord of the franchise, but it was often held in connection with a domanial court, probably always when the franchise covered only the manor. The rolls of the manor court in this case often indicate distinctly the two kinds of business, but often also the machinery of one court was used to do the business of the other.

III. *Domanial*. This is of course the manorial proper, and it ought to have that name, but so much confusion has been created by the indiscriminate use of the word that it cannot be used now without danger of being misunderstood. It has been used, and used quite commonly, for all three kinds of courts, because they all at times happen to be held with a manor as their territorial unit, and many things have in consequence been said of manor courts which are not at all true of the domanial court. They may very properly be called domanial courts because the lord to whom the court belonged was always the lord who held the manor in domain, and because the court dealt with the concerns of the manor as a domain manor, that is primarily as economic interest. It was the court of the tenants of the manor, bond and free, but not as being bond or free. Status had nothing to do with their relation to the court. Freeman help to compose it because they are tenants of the manor, just as serfs do, and free and serfs are peers of one another in the court. Occasionally a freeman may owe no suit to the domanial court, but it seems to be because his holding does not stand in intimate relation to the manor, but there are many exceptions on the



other side, of freemen seeming not to be in such relations who do owe suit, at least on some occasions, to the domanial court. The court dealt with the holdings and services of the tenants regarding the same kind of questions as the baronial courts in their sphere, but in doing so it was dealing not with questions of feudal law, that is the law of fiefs, but with customary law, the customs of the manor. The business before the court was largely economic, enforcing the services and payments due the lord. Apart from disputes among the tenants, the chief business was supervising the work of a farming community whose centre was the lord's hall and his domain.

There was also another side to the work of the domanial court. As the franchisal court was one in which the public jurisdiction of the hundred had been merged, so the domanial court was one in which the public jurisdiction of the town had been merged. The manor did not always correspond in area to a town; probably it did so oftener than the franchisal district to a hundred. Apparently the correspondence was so frequent that the town jurisdiction was absorbed throughout the country generally into domanial courts. This appears to have been done also without royal grants. It was too unimportant business for the state to concern itself with it. The civil business of a free town would be petty cases only. All important cases would go to the hundred or county court. The town court was chiefly a local police court dealing with minor offenses only. As the lord became the owner of the town, as certainly in very many cases he did, the court naturally passed with the town into his possession. Nobody had then or later any interest to object. The domanial court was therefore partly a proprietary court and partly a communal court whose proceeds belonged to the lord.

The fields of the three courts which I have described were as distinct as the fields of the contemporary civil and ecclesiastical courts. They were distinct in origin, in content, and in historical fate. In saying this I am leaving out of account the overlapping of jurisdictions, which is a constant feature of medieval courts, by which the same case might be tried either in the town or the hundred court, or in the hundred or the county court, but that fact rests upon a different principle and is not an exception to what is here said. The franchisal court administers the law of the state. Its business is mostly police or criminal, but to some extent civil. The baronial court administers feudal law proper, the law of vassals and fiefs, mostly civil, but with a quasi-criminal side though not touching offenses against the state. The domanial court administers manorial law proper, customary law technically so called,

*hofrecht*, the law of the domain and the tenures, not military but economic tenures, mostly servile but also many free belonging within the sphere of the manor and its economic interests. All these distinctions were well understood and clearly discriminated by those who were operating these courts, and though they were often careless about them, they always held them strictly apart when they had occasion to do so.

When we take up for study the facts recorded of these courts, there is apparent a confusion in them which seems to cast doubt on these assertions. The key to the confusion is economy and convenience. It was often more convenient and more economical to hold one court in connection with another, or to use one court to do the business of another, than to try to maintain two distinct courts. What was done in any particular case was largely a territorial question. If the lord had a fairly large body of military and independent freehold tenants within a reasonably compact territory, he could hold a separate baronial court. If the situation was particularly favorable, he could have a baronial court meeting in a fixed place, like the honor court of Broughton. If the fiefs that were held of him were badly scattered, he had to do the best he could. There are two things that seem to have been commonly done. One was to move his honor court about from place to place wherever he went himself, as was done by the abbot of St. Edmunds. The other was to hold it in connection with some domanial court for the tenants in its immediate vicinity. As feudalism proper declined and the larger military tenants made themselves free of suit of court, this last expedient became more and more the ruling one, and the court baron, which is the baronial court for a small territory held in connection with a domanial court, became more frequent from about the end of the thirteenth century. What is new at that time, however, is not the court but the name. Courts of this kind had been held earlier, probably from the date of the Conquest. Baronial courts proper were so uncommon in England because compact feudal lordships were uncommon.

The apparent confusion is even greater between franchisal and domanial courts. The entire hundred in the hands of a lord was somewhat, but not much more common than a compact lordship occupied by vassals. There is another reason also for confusion in this case in the similarity of franchisal business to a part of the domanial, the police business. In which court an infringement of the assize of bread and beer should be punished, seems often a matter of indifference. When it was inconvenient to hold a sepa-

rate franchisal court, it was a simple matter to do the business of the franchise in connection with a domanial court. There is still another principle of the time which must enter into the account. While a freeman, common or military, might legally object to having his cases, except purely domanial questions, decided by serfs, the serf could not object to the decision of his cases by freemen. It was easy and correct to use the baronial court as a court for reserved cases from the domanial court, though the evidence that this was actually done is very slight. It was easy to use a court baron to do the business of a domanial court, but on the contrary a court baron could not be held without some free tenants: the domanial court could not do the business of the baronial.

What I venture to suggest is that the work of investigation in this subject will proceed most fruitfully if it be used to test in detail some such theoretical reconstruction as I have attempted above. It is for the purpose of such investigation that it is submitted. In following it as a working scheme, I believe that a part of the confusion, that part at least which is subjective, ought to disappear. It is almost always possible to tell without much difficulty to what jurisdiction the business before the court belongs. It is not always possible to tell exactly what court is acting. The facts as they appear in the rolls seem to imply that the actors were not always careful to see that a change of court in form accompanied a change of business. Usually there was no reason why they should be careful. When there was something at stake, sometimes at least they were careful. There is, however, this much confusion about the facts which probably can never be removed, but there is no reason why we should submit to unnecessary confusion about things that were no doubt extremely simple to contemporaries.

GEORGE BURTON ADAMS.

#### SOME SOURCES FOR TRACING JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF CONGRESS

THE best place to find action on resolutions is the official journals of the two houses, rather than the *Globe* or the *Record*.

Simple resolutions adopted by the two houses up to August 31, 1842, are printed in the last volume of the congressional documents set for each session. They will also be found in the journals of the two houses.

The text of bills and joint and other resolutions, as introduced into Congress, can, as a rule, be found only in the files of bills and resolutions kept in the Senate Document Room at the Capitol and in the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress file begins with

the first Congress and, while incomplete, is a fairly good file for the first fourteen Congresses; from the fifteenth Congress up to about 1875, the Library of Congress file is in good shape; from 1875 to 1900 there is a gap, while from 1900 to date the file is complete. The Senate Document Room file is supposed to be complete from about 1830 to date. These two collections are the only sources from which the text of all the bills and resolutions as introduced can be found.

While the *Statutes at Large* contain the text of all the joint resolutions adopted by Congress, it seems that the index at the end of each volume either does not, or does not always, cover the joint resolutions. For the period 1789 to 1851 the joint resolutions are indexed in the *Synoptical Index to the Laws and Treaties of the United States of America from March 4, 1789, to March 3, 1851, prepared under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate* (Boston, Little and Brown, 1852). At the period of 1864, for instance, the index of the *Statutes at Large* does not include the public resolutions. Recently, however, they have been included in the indexes and these may now be depended on to cover the resolutions.

No special compilation of joint resolutions could be found in the Library of Congress law collection; the law editor of the Department of State reports that he knows of none.

A digest of the opinions of the members of the House and of the Senate as to the advantages and disadvantages of the use of the joint resolution in legislation, will be found in Hinds's *Precedents*, principally in volume IV.

A good account of the publications containing the laws of the United States will be found in the *Checklist of United States Public Documents, 1789-1909*, third edition, revised and enlarged, compiled under the direction of the Superintendent of Documents (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1911); see volume I., pages 954 ff.

HENRY J. HARRIS.

#### THE THOMPSON READERSHIP: A FORGOTTEN EPISODE OF ACADEMIC HISTORY<sup>1</sup>

PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH, it may be recalled, visited the United States for the first time in the latter part of 1864. Landing at Boston on September 2, he was soon to hear the news of the fall of Atlanta. Travelling west as far as Illinois, he visited later both

<sup>1</sup> [Interest in Dr. Learned's note will be heightened if the reader's attention is called to the announcement on page 713, below, respecting the lectures to be given in British universities during the present spring by Professor McLaughlin. Ed.]

Washington and Philadelphia, witnessed the re-election of Lincoln in November, and within the week of that event was entertained in New York City by a distinguished company at the Union League Club. Before sailing for England on December 14, he printed in the *Atlantic Monthly* a paper entitled "England and America" which abounded in well-considered contrasts and discerning comparisons. Reminding his readers that the Civil War in America impressed most Englishmen as one phase of the "irrepressible conflict between Aristocracy and Democracy", he characterized the landholders, young Tory gentry, High Church clergy, and the great manufacturing interests as against the cause of the North. He was, however, bound to admit that "there is a good deal of Northern sentiment among the young fellows of our more liberal colleges and generally in the more active minds". "We are not such a nation of travellers as you are", he reflected, "and scarcely one Englishman has seen America for a hundred Americans that have seen England".<sup>2</sup>

A comparatively unknown and youthful graduate of Cambridge University, Henry Yates Thompson (B.A. Trinity 1862), son of a wealthy Liverpool banker, had preceded Goldwin Smith, coming to the United States in either 1863 or 1864. Introduced to Edward Everett of Boston, and through him to other Americans, young Thompson obtained glimpses of Boston and Cambridge society, and was enabled to travel under peculiarly favorable auspices over the country. In politics already an advanced Liberal, an advocate of the extension of the franchise in England, an admirer of Cobden and Bright, open-minded, impressionable, and deeply interested in the success of the Union cause here, he became convinced through his visit of the widespread and deplorable ignorance of the United States which characterized especially the upper classes of his countrymen. On December 24, 1864—the day before Goldwin Smith landed at Liverpool—Mr. Thompson addressed a letter to Edward Everett in which he propounded a cherished plan. "My wish", he wrote,

is to endow a lectureship, or, as we call it at Lincoln's Inn, a readership, at Harvard University, its object being the delivery of a biennial course of twelve lectures during a residence of one term at Cambridge in England on the "History and Political Institutions of the United States of America", such reader to be appointed biennially by the President and Fellows of Harvard University (subject to the veto in each case of the

<sup>2</sup> Arnold Haultain, *Goldwin Smith: His Life and Opinions*, pp. 255 ff.; *Atlantic Monthly*, XIV. 758 ff.; cf. W. C. Ford, "Goldwin Smith's Visit to the United States", in *Mass. Hist. Soc., Proceedings*, October, 1910, XLIV. 3-13.

Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge), and his sole qualifications to be American citizenship and the opinion of his appointers that he is a fit person to deliver such a course. . . .

The readership, based on an endowment of "\$6,000 of United States Government Stock (5-20's)", was to carry the donor's name.

There were difficulties ahead both at Harvard and at the English Cambridge. The plan bore the impress of novelty. It was, moreover, without precedent. If its direct benefit to Harvard was not easily discernible, neither was it clear in what way such a course of lectures could find a place in the rather inflexible curriculum of Cambridge University, although Mr. Thompson argued that it might "form a very suitable addition to the lectures of the Professor of Modern History". However, with a distinguished American as first lecturer—the donor had in mind such men as Agassiz, Lowell, Longfellow, and Holmes—he was sure that the plan would prove in the end to be of international usefulness. Appealing for Everett's approval, he wished Everett to bring the project before the president and fellows of Harvard University for their sanction. In this way he hoped that the vice-chancellor and senate of Cambridge University could be induced to accept it.

Just after the receipt of Mr. Thompson's letter, Edward Everett died in Boston on January 15, 1865—not, however, before he had expressed mild approval of the plan to his son, William Everett. With the elder Everett's approval made known to President Thomas Hill, the matter passed promptly into the hands of the Harvard authorities. On April 29 the corporation sanctioned the plan. On May 8 President Hill sent to the vice-chancellor a discreet letter of approval. But beyond cautious expressions of interest and a suggestion on the part of Professor Henry W. Torrey that Charles Francis Adams—then our minister to England—might be a desirable choice as first lecturer, the Harvard records are exceedingly bare.<sup>3</sup>

Formal news of the Harvard sanction of the plan reached Vice-Chancellor Henry Wilkinson Cookson too late in the term to warrant him in bringing it before the Cambridge senate until autumn. In June Mr. Thompson decided to print portions of the correspondence and his own reflections on the plan in the shape of a pamphlet. Inasmuch, however, as the country went through the strain of a general election in July, an election in which young Thompson

<sup>3</sup> For extracts from or abstracts of the records at Harvard, I am indebted to the librarian, Mr. William Coolidge Lane. The records used extend from March, 1865, at intervals, to March 10, 1866.

stood along with Gladstone as a Liberal candidate for South Lancashire,<sup>4</sup> the pamphlet did not appear before the following October.<sup>5</sup> It was designed to provide every voting member of the senate with definite information regarding the plan.

The council of the senate took what appears to have been its first formal action on December 4 by calling attention to sundry difficulties and communicating these to Mr. Thompson. He in turn, on December 29, suggested that a preliminary trial be made of the plan for one year, offering at the same time to pay over to Harvard University a sum equal to the biennial accumulation of income on the amount originally designated as the endowment. Thus modifying his plan and altering the title of the readership to one on the History, Literature, and Institutions of the United States of America, he printed a leaflet in addition to the original pamphlet, still further intelligently to promote the scheme in the senate.<sup>6</sup>

Early in February, 1866, the vice-chancellor (Dr. Cartmell) announced publicly that the plan would be discussed in the senate on Saturday, February 10. On February 9 there appeared a broadside, written by Charles Kingsley, Regius Professor of Modern History, which commended the project.<sup>7</sup> This, it should be said, influenced the discussion the following day. "My own wish", wrote Kingsley, "is that the proposal be accepted as frankly as it has been made". Continuing, he said:

If there should be, in any minds, the fear that this University should be "Americanized" or "democratized", they should remember that this proposal comes from the representatives of that class in America, which regards England with most love and respect; which feels itself in increasing danger of being swamped by the lower elements of a vast democracy; which has, of late years, withdrawn more and more from public life in order to preserve its own purity and self-respect; which now holds out the right hand of fellowship to us. . . . It is morally impossible that such men should go out of their way to become propa-

<sup>4</sup> The *London Times*, June 21-July 22, *passim*. Cf. Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, II. 147, 657.

<sup>5</sup> *Copy of a Letter addressed to the Rev. The Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University*, by Henry Yates Thompson, Scholar of Trinity College. October, 1865. (Liverpool, printed by Egerton Smith and Co., *Mercury Office*, School Lane, pp. 8.) The legend, "For private circulation only", stands in brackets before the title. The only copy of this rare pamphlet known to exist in this country is in the library of Yale University.

<sup>6</sup> This three-page leaflet, "for private circulation only", is in the records of the Harvard corporation. It was sent to President Hill under the date of January 15, 1866. The next day Thompson expected to sail for the West Indies and Boston.

<sup>7</sup> *Charles Kingsley: His Letters and Memories of his Life*, edited by his wife (1877), II. 228-230.



gandists of those very revolutionary principles against which they are honourably struggling at home . . . it will be good for us that a highly-educated American gentleman should come hither. . . .

"Men were not the worse patriots or citizens", remarked Professor Joseph B. Lightfoot, "for being more cosmopolitan men of science, and a great academic body should . . . have a hand in every land". Another speaker expected "great advantages from the lectures with reference to the study of law, and cited the code of Louisiana and Story's works, originally delivered as lectures at Harvard, in proof of what might be learnt from American jurists". He named Motley as a fit incumbent of the proposed readership. To judge from the tone of this first public discussion, victory appeared to be well-nigh secured.<sup>8</sup>

Further discussion came on February 22. The circumstances of the test vote taken on that day were recorded briefly in the *London Times*:

At a Congregation this day the grace for allowing the use of a lecture-room for the trial of the proposed lectureship on American history, institutions, and literature, was rejected by the Senate by 107 votes against 81. A great many flysheets on the subject have been circulated in the University during the last day or two, and a great many non-residents came up to vote. The strength of the opposition seemed to be mainly due to a fear lest the lectures should be made a means of diffusing Unitarian opinions.<sup>9</sup>

As it happened, Leslie Stephen voted on the project and the next day (February 23) recorded his impressions to his friend, James Russell Lowell, in this wise:

The voting body—our Senate—consists of every one who has taken the degree of M. A. . . . Directly I went into the Senate House yesterday I saw at a glance that we were done for. The district round Cambridge is generally supplied with parsons . . . who can be brought up when the Church is in danger. Beings whom I recognised at once by their rustic

<sup>8</sup> *Times*, February 12, 1866.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, February 23. For additional comment upon the whole episode, see: *London Post*, *Morning Herald*, *Morning Star*, *Daily News*—all for February 23; *Pall Mall Gazette*, February 22 (second edition), 23, 26, 27, March 1; *Athenaeum*, March 3; *Boston Daily Advertiser*, March 10; *Nation* (New York), March 15. Leaders of the opposition appear to have been Messrs. Dodd of Magdalene, E. H. Perowne of Corpus, and H. R. Bailey of St. John's. Among the newspapers, only the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the *Star* had any real regrets over the result. The *Times* was especially gratified in view of what it regarded as a possibility—that George Bancroft, the historian, might be sent as first lecturer. On February 12—the anniversary of Lincoln's birth—Bancroft had delivered an oration on Lincoln in the House of Representatives in Washington, in which he took occasion to abuse England and her institutions. Even the *Pall Mall Gazette* of February 27 regarded his remarks as "worthy of Elijah Pogram".

appearance, ancient and shiny silk gowns, elaborate white ties and shabby hats instead of college caps, were swarming all around me. The sons of Zeruiah were too many for us. . . . They began by bemoaning themselves about democracy without much effect, when one of them luckily discovered for the first time that you were Socinians, and that effectually did the business. Every intelligent man in the place voted for the professorship, including even Kingsley, who was very energetic about it, though he has been unsound upon America generally; but when once the Church is having its foundations sapped, and that by an American democrat, it would be easier to argue with a herd of swine than British parsons. . . .<sup>10</sup>

To Lowell the result was evidently not surprising. "I doubt", he replied, "if the lectureship could have done much good. England *can't* like America . . . and I doubt if I could; were I an Englishman. . . . As for 'Socinianism', heavens! we've got several centuries ahead of *that*, some of us, or behind it, if you please."<sup>11</sup>

HENRY BARRETT LEARNED.

<sup>10</sup> F. W. Maitland, *The Life and Letters of Leslie Stephen* (1906), pp. 176 ff.

<sup>11</sup> *Letters of James Russell Lowell*, edited by Charles Eliot Norton (1894), I. 360-361. Lowell was convinced that the Harvard corporation would never consider George Bancroft for the readership—"of all men in the world!"

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

*A Short History of Science.* By W. T. SEDGWICK, Professor of Biology, and H. W. TYLER, Professor of Mathematics, in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1917. Pp. xv, 474. \$2.50.)

No more difficult literary or historical task can well be imagined than writing a really good history of science. The author must have a sound appreciation of all periods in the history of civilization to depict the progress of science in its proper setting. He must have training in historical criticism and method to treat the past of science in a truly scientific spirit. He must be acquainted with all the particular sciences to present adequately their common story. Finally, besides organizing his material in due proportion and order, he must possess the literary capacity to translate and express in a fashion comprehensible to the general reader the difficult terminology of the natural sciences, the complexities of modern mechanism, and the abstractions of advanced mathematics.

Such a combination of faculties is seldom found in one person. In the volume under review two professors of biology and mathematics essay the task, and also call into requisition the services of many other writers. Indeed the book is often little more than a patching together of quotations, which are more often taken from secondary or tertiary accounts than from the sources. For instance, practically the entire treatment of Egypt, Babylon and Assyria, Phoenicia, and the Hebrews consists of long excerpts from Verschoyle's *The History of Ancient Civilization*, published in 1889. The ten pages devoted to Newton contain 116 lines by the authors, and 244 lines in smaller type from other writers. In general, some of the best foreign authorities are not used, little acquaintance is shown with recent monographs and detailed research in the history of science, and the quotations made are of very unequal worth and interest. The authors' own style tends to be dry and technical. However, the best parts of the book are where they cut loose from authorities and quotations, and write in their own words of matters with which they are personally conversant.

After nine chapters on ancient and medieval times, the remaining eight chapters deal with mathematics and natural science in the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. In each chapter the treatment is partly by topics, partly by persons. The appendixes comprise eight source-selections, a list of modern inventions, and a

(609)

chronological table. Anthropology and archaeology are discussed somewhat, but psychology and the social sciences are not included. Radium, Roentgen rays, aeroplanes, automobiles, submarines, typewriters are not mentioned. Indeed, the work does not enter the present century.

The distribution of space is sometimes unequal. Two pages are given to Anaximander and Anaximenes, of whom we know next to nothing, and less than a page to Pliny and Galen, two of our chief repositories of ancient science. Why a page should be devoted to Petrarch in a history of science is hard to see. Although maps are discussed more than once and appear as illustrations, nothing is said of the medieval *portolani*, our first true maps, nor is Beazley listed in the bibliographies. A good feature is the emphasis upon Alexandrian science.

Some specific errors are the use (p. 8) of "Chaldeans" for the earliest inhabitants of Babylonia; the attribution (p. 22) of the planetary week to prehistoric instead of Hellenistic times (see Webster, *Rest Days*, pp. 215-222); and the ascription (p. 177) of the *Imitatio Christi* to Thomas Aquinas. The usual erroneous statements concerning Roger Bacon are repeated. Although they have read Rashdall's *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, the authors seem uncertain (pp. 175, 177, 186) whether Aristotle's works in natural philosophy were studied in the thirteenth century or not until the Italian Renaissance. They state (pp. 113, 255) that the arteries were believed to be air tubes from the time of Cicero to the sixteenth century, in ignorance of the fact that Galen proved by experiment that they contain blood.

LYNN THORNDIKE.

*From Pericles to Philip.* By T. R. GLOVER, Fellow and Lecturer of St. John's College, Cambridge, and University Lecturer in Ancient History. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1917. Pp. xi, 405. \$3.00.)

READERS of Mr. Glover's *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, his *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, and his *Virgil* will know what to expect in the present volume. It is not a systematic history. He does not attempt original investigation, but aims at a pleasant, Gaston Boissier effect of fluent commentary and quotation and modern instances within the framework marked out by the general topic. The present book, however, has rather less unity of composition than its predecessors and does not quite live up to its title. The first five chapters, the Traveller in the Greek World (Herodotus), the Age of Pericles, Thucydides, Athens in the War Time, Euripides, are a fairly consecutive study of Athenian civilization in the age of Pericles and the Peloponnesian War, though Aristophanes is cited only in illustration of war-time conditions. But the continuation of the story through the first half of the fourth century is skimmed. The remaining chapters, with one or two slight exceptions, are little more than academic lectures on Xenophon under various disguises. There is no attempt to portray the life and

thought of the time as reflected in Plato, Isocrates, the orators, and the fragments of the drama.

The student who waives these cavils and accepts the book for what it is will find it readable throughout and quite sufficiently scholarly and instructive. The gossip and anecdotal chapter on Herodotus will serve as well as that in any history of Greek literature for comparison with Bury (*The Ancient Greek Historians*). The author does not share all of Professor Bury's doubts of the entire sincerity of Herodotus's naïveté about Greek oracles and miracles. In any case, he says, "it may be remarked that more is said today about Miletus and the Milesian spirit than it is easy to find evidence for".

A rather miscellaneous chapter on the Age of Pericles serves as the transition to Thucydides. Mr. Glover is quite up-to-date in his imperfect sympathy with Sophocles. "The Samian expedition was a wicked one—as bad as the Melian—and Sophocles made no protest, wrote no *Troades*." This may amuse the scholar who will read it in the true interlinear version thus, "the Crimean War was a wicked one—as bad as the German invasion of Belgium—but Tennyson made no protest, he wrote no Shavian epistles to the American newspapers". But what of the innocent general reader who may believe that the Samian expedition was as unjustifiable as the Melian, or that there is some evidence that the *Troades* was a protest against the taking of Melos, or that Sophocles could have written as poor a play as the *Troades* if he had tried? The "perfectly good" chapter on Thucydides calls for little comment. Professor Glover thinks that in spite of the intellectualism and the self-restraint "the warm sympathies are there", and he will not admit the touch of malice that the present reviewer and Professor Bury found in the epitaph of Nicias who practised all conventional(?) virtue. We cannot perpetually reargue the case of Euripides. The modernist exaltation of him is in part a matter of irreducible taste and temperament. Sober criticism can only point out that it is supported by the imputation to him of ineffable anticipations of modern thought and sentiment which his undramatic discursiveness and the very vagueness, not to say impropriety, of his diction enable translators of genius to read into him. Aristophanes's indictment, ratified by Jebb, Professor Glover dismisses with the question-begging progressive cliché, "the forward movement of the human mind is not to be held up by banter even if it is banter of genius". But what if the movement from Aeschylus and Sophocles to Euripides was not a forward movement?

In spite of the precedent of Mahaffy, who used him in the same way, we cannot consider Xenophon the best typical representative of fourth-century Greek civilization, and, subject to correction, must regard the remaining chapters of the book as adaptations of material prepared for other purposes. There are two exceptions. The chapter on Persia is a useful survey of topics scattered through our Greek histories but rarely brought together as here in one purview. "The House of Pasion"

retells in interesting fashion after Isocrates and the private orations of Demosthenes the oft-told tale of an Athenian banking house in the fourth century. Mr. Glover's foot-notes refer to the original sources and to the German treatises on Athenian law and antiquities. But he does not mention his French and American predecessors in the recital of the entire story.

PAUL SHOREY.

#### BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*Études sur la Polémique Religieuse à l'Époque de Grégoire VII.: Les Prêgrégoriens.* By AUGUSTIN FLICHE, Chargé de Cours à l'Université de Bordeaux. (Paris: Société Française d'Imprimerie et de Librairie. 1916. Pp. viii, 343. 4 fr.)

IN subjecting the writings of the churchmen of the middle of the eleventh century to painstaking analysis M. Fliche is traversing well-worn ground, but in spite of this he has arrived at conclusions that challenge the attention, and make necessary a readjustment of the emphasis usually laid on the work of Hildebrand and his contemporaries in the struggle for Church reform. The overpowering personality of the great pope and the dramatic nature of his struggle with Henry IV. have led historians to ascribe to him, almost exclusively, the credit for the reform movement and for the leading features of the programme adopted by the papacy. His influence has been looked upon as the dominating factor in the situation from the accession of Leo IX., and the popes from 1048 to 1072 have been considered little more than the agents of the astute papal secretary who came to the throne in the latter year.

While not denying the importance of the work accomplished by Hildebrand as pope, M. Fliche has shown by a careful study of the writings of such men as Peter Damiani and Cardinal Humbert that much more importance must be attached to their theories and arguments than has generally been given. The main part of the book is taken up with a painstaking analysis of the writings of these two men, who are allowed to express themselves largely in their own words. Such a method leads to much repetition of their leading ideas and sometimes becomes monotonous reading, but it is effective in bringing out M. Fliche's main thesis that too much stress has been heretofore laid on Hildebrand's part in initiating the reform movement. He did not inspire their views as to the needs of the Church, and yet their writings express most of the policies he later sought to carry out. They both saw in the degradation of the Church the results of the extensive immorality and worldliness of the clergy; but they differed as to the means to be employed in extirpating these evils. Damiani, with the ascetic's point of view, wished to see the clergy reformed by the introduction of monastic organization among them. They should bind themselves to rules of fasting, poverty, and celibacy, and lead such ascetic lives that the temptations to simony

should disappear. On the other hand he saw no sufficient reason to deny the emperor an important place in the direction of the Church and looked to see him and the pope acting hand in hand in its affairs. In this he differed radically from Cardinal Humbert, who desired the complete removal of secular influence from the Church and saw in the prohibition of lay investiture the only means of destroying simony. Both views found expression in the reforms of Gregory VII., who combined them and carried them out with a statesman's abilities.

In other portions of his book M. Fliche studies the pontificates of Leo IX., Nicholas II., and Alexander II., ascribing to them a somewhat more substantial and independent rôle than they have usually been assigned. The whole study deserves the careful consideration of students, as it corrects some older judgments and places the ecclesiastical movements of the eleventh century in a truer perspective.

A. C. H.

*Italy, Mediaeval and Modern: a History.* By E. M. JAMISON, C. M. ADY, K. D. VERNON, and C. SANFORD TERRY. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1917. Pp. viii, 564. 12 sh. 6 d.)

THERE has always been a surprising lack of good comprehensive one-volume histories of Italy, written in English, or for that matter, in any language. This recent publication by the Clarendon Press represents an attempt to supply that lack. On the whole, the task is well done; although, now that it is done, one may ask the exact need that the book answers. It can hardly be meant for specialists. Its comparative brevity and the complete absence of foot-notes prevent that. The college student is already well provided with good material in English, general and specialized, upon Italian history. The editor in his preface suggests that the book will serve as an introduction to more detailed study of the subject. If such a need exists for the general reader, this book will fill the need with considerable success.

Although it appears from the title-page that the work is co-operative, one seeks in vain, and perhaps happily so, for evidence thereof in the text. One assumes, it may be without reason, that Mrs. K. D. Vernon, already well known for her volume, *Italy from 1494 to 1790*, in the *Cambridge Historical Series*, is responsible for the three chapters covering the same period in the present work. In the table of contents, however, no statement is made of the sections assigned to each author.

Roughly speaking, one-third of the text is devoted to Italian history from about 375 to 1250; another third, to the period from 1250 to 1789; and the rest to the evolution of Italian unity. The first section, upon the medieval period, seems to the reviewer the least satisfactory, perhaps because one inevitably compares it with so much good material already in existence upon the same age. In slightly more than fifty pages the political history of the era is covered, and then in about forty more the development of the papacy. Twenty pages are devoted to the Norman kingdom



in the south; one looks in vain, and perhaps without justification in so short a chapter, for the charm of Professor Haskins's two chapters on the same subject. The last chapter in the section, that upon Religion and the Civil Tradition, inevitably suggests Mr. H. O. Taylor's *Mediaeval Mind*.

The middle section of the book, upon the period from 1250 to 1789, seemed to the reviewer its best part. The political history of the years from 1250 to 1315 is rapidly passed over, and there follow three excellent chapters upon the Despots, the Renaissance, and the Italian Wars. In view of the little space at his disposal, the author of the chapter on the Despots paints a surprisingly complete and accurate picture. In reading the story of the Italian Wars, one admires the boldness with which the author condenses the mass of detail into four pages, and then effectually summarizes the lasting results of the period. Of particular value, because of the great lack of material in English upon the subject, is the forty-page chapter on the Social and Intellectual History of the period 1528-1789.

The section upon the evolution of unity is, again, in view of the need of condensation, satisfactory as an introduction to more detailed studies. It would not be fair to compare this part of the book with studies like those of Bolton King. Nothing original was attempted. One does regret, however, that only eleven pages have been assigned to the period since 1870.

For the sake of a later edition, it may not seem out of place to note that "seven centuries had" *not* "exactly passed between the promise of Pippin and the death of Innocent IV." (p. 93).

A bibliography is appended, which does not claim to be complete, but only to "indicate a few of the more obvious and readily accessible sources". It is, nevertheless, a very useful, and, in general, well-chosen list; hardly anywhere else can one find so good an introductory bibliography for the beginner. One notices with surprise, however, the absence of Hazlitt's *History of Venice*. For the Risorgimento, only "a few accessible works" are given; it is strange not to find Mr. W. R. Thayer's life of Cavour.

T. F. J.

*Hugo Grotius, the Father of the Modern Science of International Law.* By HAMILTON VREELAND, jr., LL.B., Ph.D. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1917. Pp. xiii, 258. \$2.00.)

At the present juncture, a study of the life and purposes of Hugo Grotius is especially appropriate, for the greatest of his works, the *De Jure Belli ac Pacis*, was dictated by a desire to introduce into the relations between states an order based upon ethical principles and the accepted practices of nations, and to combat what our author characteristically describes as "the hideous, lying diplomacy of Machiavelli's Prince" (p. 176). Hence the appearance of this interesting sketch of

the life of Grotius is most timely, the more so as there is no adequate biography available in English, and the standard biographies, that of Brandt and van Cattenburgh in Dutch and that of Burigny in French, date back respectively to 1727 and 1752.

From the biographer's point of view, the work, though admittedly exiguous and uncritical, is quite satisfactory: the author has succeeded in giving a sympathetic picture of the chief incidents in the life of Grotius and in explaining clearly the problems and controversies with which he had to deal. If any portion of the book were to be singled out as particularly worthy of mention, it would probably be the account of the diplomatic activities of Grotius at Paris as the ambassador of Queen Christina of Sweden. Perhaps the body of the text has been too much padded with lengthy citations, but in truth the citations are so well chosen that this will scarcely be noticed. It is a matter of regret, however, that in writing the life of a world-figure of the significance of Grotius, the author has satisfied himself so completely with the results reached by Brandt and Burigny in the eighteenth century and has not undertaken a more careful study of the abundant original and supplementary printed materials.

It is, however, in his attempts to estimate the value of the juristic writings of Grotius, that our author lays himself open to more serious criticism. Thus the discussion in chapter VIII. as to the nature and development of the *jus gentium* and its relation to the *jus naturale* would seem to one familiar with either the English or the German treatises on Roman law a rather unfortunate labor of supererogation; however, if it were necessary, why should the classic conclusions reached by Maine in 1861 on the subject be accepted without reference to this literature? Again, the naïve conception of Machiavelli as the author of a "hideous Machiavellian philosophy" apparently fails to recognize his importance as the first writer to accept a distinction between individual and political standards of conduct. And one searches in vain to justify the author's estimate of Grotius as the great advocate of the court of universal arbitration (p. 242).

It may be of interest to note that the reply to Selden's *Mare Clausum*, which the States General authorized Graswinckel—who had assisted Grotius in the redaction of the *De Jure Belli ac Pacis*—to write (p. 48), later found its way to the press, at least in a modified form, in 1652. Also, the exemption granted in 1622 to the Dutch refugees by Louis XIII. (p. 155) was from the *droit d'aubaine* familiar to students of the prerogative.

In conclusion, it may be said that the work under consideration is of value as a popular exposition of most interesting facts not otherwise ordinarily available. But it can by no means be regarded as a thorough-going and critical study of the life of the "Father of International Law". The last word yet remains to be said.

HESSEL E. YNTEMA.

*Party Politics and English Journalism, 1702-1742.* By DAVID HARRISON STEVENS, Ph.D., Instructor in English in Chicago University. (Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Publishing Company. 1916. Pp. xii, 156. \$1.50.)

HISTORIANS and makers of literary history have generally ignored journalism and its workers; the history of journalism has been written by journalists; and history has suffered by both the commissions and the omissions. This study is therefore welcome, for it lies in a neglected field which is important in itself, and also for the light that through it may be thrown on politics, literature, and the Church. The scope of the book is shown by the chapter titles: the Conditions of Literary Production from 1702 to 1710; the Political Importance of Addison after 1712; Swift's Relations with the Tory Minister; Defoe and the Earl of Oxford; Party Journals and Journalists from 1710 to 1714; Whig Rewards under George I.; Defoe and Walpole in the Service of George I.; and Political and Literary Importance of the *Craftsman* Group.

Rather more than might be expected, emphasis is laid on biography, with the successful intention of adding to our knowledge of the principal figures—Addison, Swift, and Defoe. A considerable amount of new matter regarding these men is presented, and new aspects of this much-studied period, especially of the inter-relations of politics and literature, are revealed. That part of the study which concerns the history of journalism is least satisfactory. More background and perspective is needed. Thorough treatment of the period would require the patient reading of innumerable newspapers in the two collections which Dr. Stevens refers to and in the Nichols collection, apparently not examined, which contains many papers not seen by the writer, and which would have cleared away much of the perceptible haziness and vagueness. The main currents of precedent journalism would have been useful by way of introduction; some view of the principal tendencies of journalism then current is sorely missed. The influence of a swarm of papers which preceded the *Review* and the *Tatler*, not political only, but literary, meteorological, agricultural—all a part of the background, might well have been kept in mind. The powerfully irritating intrusion of ecclesiastical motives in politics and journalism is not made clear. Many leading journalists, like Tutchin, Leslie, Boyer, and Roper, are merely named; the characters of important papers like *Mist's* and *Applebee's* are not portrayed. The influence of L'Estrange which persisted in journalistic use of dialogue, the beginnings of the leading editorial, the importance of the tri-weeklies before 1715 and of the weeklies afterwards—these and many other matters not here mentioned are essential to a just estimate of the journalism of the time.

Many statements in the biographical material would prove interesting subjects for discussion, for which there is no room. In the careful account of Defoe's pay, Mr. Charles Dalton's important discovery that a

Daniel Defoe was entered in a list of half-pay officers of 1714 as Capt.-Lieut. has been overlooked. This omission, and others, suggest that the leading authority on Defoe and his times was not consulted in the preparation of this study. Specialists in the field are so few that the investigator who labors in the history of journalism cannot safely ignore any of them.

A few minor slips may be noted. "Dr. Brown" (p. 12) should be Joseph Browne; Browne, not Drake, wrote *A Letter to the Right Honorable . . .* (p. 13); Mr. Ward of Hackney was not Ned or Edward Ward (p. 13); Mrs. Manley's name was Mary (p. 65); Prior's "Whig poem" is mostly prose (p. 68); Leonard Welsted, "government clerk", was a poet, a man of letters in politics (p. 84).

FRANK W. SCOTT.

*The Monarchy in Politics.* By JAMES ANSON FARRER. (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company. 1917. Pp. ix, 342. \$3.00.)

STUDENTS of English constitutional history, and in particular students of the development, from the Revolution of 1688 to the end of the nineteenth century, of government by a cabinet dependent upon a majority in the House of Commons, can freely admit their indebtedness to Mr. Farrer for his study of the monarchy in politics, without feeling called upon to accept or endorse all his conclusions. Mr. Farrer's book is a study of the interference of the crown in politics, chiefly of its interference in political questions—home, colonial, and foreign—which had arrived at a stage at which action had to be taken by the cabinet. There is little discussion of the interference of the crown in parliamentary elections; although a complete end to the activities of the sovereign in that phase of politics is not traceable until Queen Victoria came to the throne in 1837. The reigns included in Mr. Farrer's survey are those of George III., George IV., William IV., and Victoria.

Mr. Farrer begins abruptly with the opening years of the reign of George III., with no introductory sketch of the development of the cabinet from the reign of Queen Anne to the end of the reign of George II. For students of English history who are familiar with the library of political biography, autobiography, memoirs, recollections, diaries, and letters that has steadily accumulated in the century and a half since 1760, there is not much that can be described as revealing in Mr. Farrer's pages. But even students who are well versed in this literature, and who know where to turn for instances of interference by sovereigns in the plans and policies of cabinets, are much indebted to Mr. Farrer for the industry and skill with which he has worked the vein in biography and letters to which he has turned his attention, and also for the readable form in which he has presented the results of his quarrying.

It is possible to recall only one other book in which this subject is discussed at length. Dunkley, under the *nom de plume* of Verax, wrote

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—40.

on it in 1878. But Dunckley was concerned only with the instances of Queen Victoria's interference with the cabinet that were revealed in the earlier volumes of Martin's *Life of the Prince Consort*. Mr. Farrer's book, as has been indicated, is much more comprehensive; and the material embodied in it is of particular value to those students of the history of cabinet government in England who have not had opportunities for following the relations of the cabinet and the crown, and of the cabinet and Parliament, in what may not inappropriately be called the primary sources.

To discuss Mr. Farrer's conclusions would call for half a dozen pages of the *American Historical Review*. Even in this brief note, however, attention must be directed to one of them.

The course of events [he writes] whilst reducing the appearance of monarchical power, has tended to its increase in reality; for although the actual veto has passed into disuse, the veto precedent has become a more serious barrier against any legislation distasteful to the crown. Mr. Lecky's statement that "the English sovereignty is so restricted in its province that it has, or ought to have, no real influence on legislation" is hardly borne out by the influence exercised over legislation by George III., George IV., William IV., and Queen Victoria.

George III. wrought successfully to make a failure of Pitt's bill of 1785 for the reform of the representative system. George III. and George IV. delayed Catholic emancipation for at least one generation; and enormous pressure was necessary before William IV. would accept Grey's terms in regard to the Reform Act of 1832. But the history of popular political agitations in England from 1832 to the end of the nineteenth century, when compared with the additions to the statute book during those sixty-eight years, would not seem to warrant Mr. Farrer's conclusions in regard to what he describes as the "veto precedent"—the sanction of the crown before the cabinet can introduce an important bill to Parliament. The writer of this note, while thoroughly appreciating the usefulness of Mr. Farrer's contribution to the history of the cabinet, could not subscribe to this sweeping conclusion of the author. It is not possible to accept it in view of the numerous movements for reform from Waterloo to the death of Queen Victoria which were attended with legislative success.

*Life of John Wilkes.* By HORACE BLEACKLEY. (London and New York: John Lane Company. 1917. Pp. xiii, 464. \$5.00.)

*Wilkes and the City.* By WILLIAM PURDIE TRELOAR. (London: John Murray. 1917. Pp. xxvi, 299. 12 sh.)

THE career of John Wilkes was not well calculated to win him a place in the *Twelve English Statesmen Series*. At first cautiously tolerated by respectable Whigs, he finally won recognition by the party, only to prove a renegade in the end by going over to the Tories. The Whigs could not laud a man who had deserted them, or the Tories one

who joined them after using up all his ammunition in the service of their enemies. For nearly a century, therefore, no one had a good word to say for John Wilkes; and even as late as 1874, John Richard Green, a Liberal and likely to be generous in his appreciations, passed him by with a reference to the scurrility of his writings and the licentiousness of his morals. In time, of course, rehabilitation was bound to come. Begun by Charles W. Dilke, and continued by Sir George Trevelyan and Percy Fitzgerald, it is now fairly completed by Mr. Bleackley and Mr. Treloar.

Of the two works, that of Mr. Bleackley is the more scholarly. Mr. Bleackley has carefully examined the Wilkes papers and other manuscript material in the British Museum, as well as all the printed sources. Other books will doubtless be written about the Friend of Liberty, but one can hardly suppose it will ever again be worth while to set down in clear and sober prose a detailed narrative of the events of his life. It is well known that every one makes mistakes (Mr. Freeman has said so), but it seems unlikely that Mr. Bleackley has made very many; and where he differs from Mr. Treloar in any matter, as for example whether, on a certain occasion, the marshal and the tipstiffs were dragged from their seats in the carriage before or after the arrival at the Three Tuns Tavern—on any such point of difference the chances are that Mr. Bleackley is right. Mr. Treloar indeed makes no pretensions to the character of a trained historian, nor does he claim to have written an account of the events of Wilkes's career. His interest in the subject dates from 1881, when he was chosen a member of the London Corporation from the ward which elected Wilkes—Farringdon Without; and since then he has read, out of pure interest, whatever came his way about his famous predecessor, and about the City of that day. In this way he has become familiar with a great many documents; from which, without making such an analysis of them as authorities on historical method recommend, he has extracted what seem to him the most interesting parts; and these he has arranged in proper order, himself furnishing little more than the connecting commentary necessary to make the story intelligible. The reader will therefore go to Mr. Bleackley for a detailed statement of the facts of Wilkes's life; and to Mr. Treloar for many interesting and more or less relevant documents.

From neither writer will the reader get much that is striking or original in the way of an interpretation of the man and his times. In Mr. Bleackley's book one meets of course all the familiar people; but while the author knows a great deal about them, he seems not to visualize them very effectively, or at least fails to make the reader do so, having apparently neither taste nor talent for analysis of character or convincing portraiture of personalities. At times, in the course of the long level journey, one wishes the precise guide had a touch of Carlyle's magic power of making the dead rise and speak—not that it is right to



expect a guide to be a genius. Consistency, however, one may expect above all from a guide; yet it is difficult to make out precisely what Mr. Bleackley thinks of the reign of George III. and of Wilkes's part in it. The achievements of Wilkes are regarded as "stupendous"—it was his "proud privilege . . . to preserve one of the most essential principles of English liberty"; but still George III. is not to be condemned for departing from "the principles of the Revolution" because such a condemnation "involves the proposition that the growth of the nation . . . has been directed . . . more wisely by a legislative assembly elected more or less under popular suffrage than it could have been under any other form of government, a proposition that will find an emphatic contradiction in the history of Japan or modern Germany". Therefore "we cannot tell to what extent the nation might have profited under the rule of a benevolent autocrat, assisted by the wisest ministers . . . untrammelled by the vicissitudes of party strife". This last is true; but if George III.'s German system was as likely to confer benefits as that of the Whigs, it is difficult to see where Wilkes comes in as the proud defender of "one of the most essential principles of English liberty".

Perhaps Mr. Bleackley means only that there are different kinds of liberty, equally good, and that Wilkes was indispensable to the preservation of the kind which is English. However defined, it is still possible to doubt that liberty owes so much to Wilkes. It does not appear clearly so from this careful narrative of his career; and it is not until the last chapter, in which Mr. Bleackley sketches the verdict of posterity and attempts to make an estimate of the real importance of Wilkes, that one becomes aware of his greatness. Mr. Bleackley does not place Wilkes among the "immortals"; but he was "undoubtedly a man of genius", as much "in earnest as any man who ever fought for freedom", a man who "probably . . . influenced more powerfully the Spirit of the Age" than any of his contemporaries. In so far as he failed, he did so principally because he was a generation ahead of his times. To be sure he had his defects—"to morality, of course, he made no pretence"; but he had his excellent qualities also—he never harbored malice toward his enemies, was generous and good-natured, loyal to his friends, and passionately and genuinely attached to his daughter.

It is very true that Wilkes was good-natured and generous, harboring no malice although creating much, kind to his daughter and loyal to his friends. He was, for example, extremely fond of Churchill. But these virtues were the least one could expect from a sad dog like Wilkes, an absolutely irresponsible person for whom life was an adventure and politics a game for high stakes. He played the game and won it; against great odds he won it by virtue of his exceptional talents—by virtue of his cleverness and wit, his reckless daring, his good nature, the generous expenditure of what was his and of what was not his, and a certain sustained brazen effrontery raised to the point of sublimity;



and he won it because the times were such as to give an opening to these peculiar talents. In playing the game of politics, Wilkes put on the dress of liberal ideas; and by winning the game he contributed something, even a good deal, to make the dress fashionable; but it is too much to say that without his example the dress would not have become the settled custom.

No doubt the man was sincere, in one sense—in the sense that Stephen A. Douglas was sincere in not caring whether slavery was voted up or down. It is difficult for a man who does not care, to be insincere. Wilkes did not care. If Wilkes had really cared about liberty it would indeed be “remarkable that one who could write so well has left little that survives”. Perhaps the truth is that he left little—nothing in fact—that survives, because he had nothing to say when he wrote well. He wrote well when it was a question of lampooning some one outrageously; whether the facts supported the lampoon or not, it had to be done outrageously or it was not done well. In behalf of liberty, Wilkes could write an excellent attack on the Earl of Sandwich or upon the king; but about liberty itself he could write nothing but puerile and stilted commonplace. It is for this reason that one may doubt whether, fifty years later, Wilkes’s “liberal ideas must have given him an important place in the government of his country”. Liberal ideas, or any ideas, unsupported by conviction or character, ideas merely caught on the run and pressed into desperate service, are not likely to give a man an important place in the government of his country. Besides, it would seem, from all accounts, that there was an excellent opportunity, during the years from 1774 to 1790, for a member of Parliament with liberal ideas, or any ideas, to play a considerable part. Wilkes was in Parliament during those years; but, although he vociferated as loudly as ever (until he joined the Tories) that the “voice of the people is the voice of God”, Mr. Bleackley admits that his followers were disappointed in the hope that “he would prove as puissant in the Senate as he had been in the market-place”.

Wilkes’s place was indeed in the market-place. A born agitator, he was an irresponsible adventurer in politics whose services to the cause of liberty were slight in proportion to the noise he made and the rancors he created; and Mr. Bleackley’s excellent narrative of the facts of Wilkes’s career serves to confirm rather than to disprove this opinion. The judgment of Horace Walpole, which Mr. Treloar quotes, if a little caustic is still essentially just: “Wantonness rather than ambition or vengeance guided his hand, and though he became a martyr to the best cause there was nothing in his principles or his morals that led him to care under what government he lived. To laugh and riot and scatter firebrands with him was liberty. Despotism will ever reproach Freedom with the profligacy of such a saint.”

CARL BECKER.

*A History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century.* By JOHN THEODORE MERZ. Volume IV. (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1914. Pp. xii, 825. 20 sh.)

THE continuation of Merz's history of philosophy in the nineteenth century—the fourth volume of his *History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century*—completes the vast survey of reflective thought whose two first volumes presented the strides and revolutions in scientific theory during the last century.

This treatment of philosophy has not equalled in interest or value his presentation of scientific doctrine. In the latter field Merz has told the story of the import of the unprecedented advances of scientific research and discovery. It was a story as yet untold in English. It had behind it his complete grip on scientific data and his sympathetic comprehension of the scientists' undertaking to build doctrines adequate to the achievement of their discoveries. Even here, however, Dr. Merz revealed a philosophic attitude which affected his estimate of the value of scientific theory. The dominant place he awarded to the energist's theory indicated that the universality of a theory overbalanced in his judgment its function on the frontiers of scientific research. The theory of energy springs from the thermodynamic laws, themselves the outgrowth of the theory of the steam-engine, and has played little or no part in the later investigations gathering about the structure of matter, those investigations which have sprung from the recent study of electricity and radio-activity. Perhaps a similar indication of failure of perspective in estimating the import of scientific attitude is found in the author's discussions of vitalism in the second volume of his history. This personal equation may be stated as a failure to accept fully the scientist's attitude toward his theory. Since science has become self-consciously an undertaking of research, testing its progress solely by experiment, theory has lost that value which has belonged to it in philosophy and religious dogma. The present perfection of the theory and the spread of its application give to it in science no title to permanence. Theory in scientific research serves only the function of the formulation and generalization of present scientific method. With new problems—and it is only in meeting new problems that modern science is alive—inevitably new theory must arise. Finality in this field is neither a goal nor a desideratum.

This attitude of Dr. Merz has but restricted importance in estimating the great value of his first two volumes. The materials are so fully presented within text and foot-notes that no one need fail to grasp the onward movement of organizing thought as it sought to command the multitudinous results of investigations and experiments. It has, however, a more serious aspect in the last two volumes, which deal with philosophic doctrine. Here we find the same generous recognition of all the thinkers in all the nations whose thought has played an essential part in the philosophy of the century. There is the same exhaustive

familiarity with the enormous literature, the same determined effort to comprehend, and the same freedom of vision from all the different stand-points of different peoples and social classes and religious attitudes. But the temper is changed. In the midst of the scientific achievements the enthusiasm of constant discovery inevitably accompanies even the historian of swiftly changing scientific hypotheses. In the field of philosophy the mind that seeks comprehension, organization, and finality gazes with disappointment at the dismemberment of old systems, the early setting of the sun of German romantic idealism, and the seeming incapacity of modern philosophic thought to bring to systematic order the vast field of conflicting ideas which nineteenth-century discovery and research has opened up. The author assumes that systematic thinking must accomplish this task, but it has yet to be done. The German idealists undertook it, and their enthusiasm and daring for a while seemed adequate to the undertaking. But they belong to the first third of the century, and their effort reappearing in English and American neo-Hegelianism has lived as short a life. Nor has the positivism of Comte, nor the phenomenism of Mill, nor the agnostic philosophy of Spencer, been able to erect the single comprehending structure where modern ideas may live at peace with each other. Dr. Merz assumes that some other colossal minds must achieve what neither Hegel nor Comte nor Mill nor Spencer could achieve. It is evident that such a demand on the historian's part must affect his treatment of his material and his estimate of its value. It is this frame of mind which explains the space given to the German idealists who strove to accomplish what is Dr. Merz's conception of philosophy's task. Not only are these thinkers presented once, but where their doctrines and spiritual influences are felt in other fields the author rehearses their undertakings. In the actual number of pages they occupy three times the space that should be accorded them. This is especially true because Dr. Merz is writing not a history of philosophic systems in these two volumes but of nineteenth-century thought as it is evidenced in philosophy. They are indeed the most imposing structures of the century, but thought has refused to abide in them, and the historian of that thought must be willing to go with the uneasy changing mind of the time, without backward and lingering glances at the imposing but deserted dwellings which thought has abandoned. For the same reason Dr. Merz has not sensed the import of the advent of science in the field of social problems. Comte's doctrine is also an imposing structure, but this mighty dwelling-place never really housed other European thought than his own. The structure was unimportant. The urge of men toward the most intricate, the most difficult of problems, that of society, and the demand that scientific method should be used here as it had been used in physical nature, was most significant. Perhaps more than anything else this demand has been responsible for the breakdown of the philosophic system-making, that Merz deplors. Not until the individual and the social

group from which he arises have been restated in scientific fashion will it be possible to approach again the meaning of the problems of subjectivity and the objective world out of which man springs, with his subjective experience. It is this insistent social problem as well as the inroads of biology into psychology that lies behind the uncertainties of mind and body. And this social problem finally is the form that religious thought is slowly taking. In a word Dr. Merz has not succeeded in presenting the often sunken obstacles against which philosophic speculation has split and the barriers that have sent single streams of thought abroad into many channels. For his pen, thinking is the domain of the observer, the contemplator, who if he fulfills the task of thought must bring all within an ordered landscape. It is not the method by which men ceaselessly seek solutions for their insistent changing problems.

This perhaps ungracious comment on a great work does not in any sense do justice to its value to the student and the thinker who would orient himself with reference to the thinkers of the past century. The full quotations, the always interesting foot-notes, the continual cross-references, the sustained style, make this volume valuable as have been those that preceded it, though the field has not the novelty in English which had that which his first two volumes traversed. In spite of his announced purpose to write the history of thought and not the history of philosophies, he has not been able to do more than give a competent and sympathetic account of philosophic doctrines, with much that is illuminating from the biographies of the philosophers. But though the determining factors in the direction of the streams of thought have been largely changed by social conditions, Dr. Merz has given his readers the resultants of these movements as they have crystallized in the minds of individual thinkers rather than the stream in its living course.

It is more readable than are the histories of modern philosophy. It does not in the fashion of these treatises tease out the fibres of systematic doctrine, and it is comprehensive and appreciative. To be sure at times one meets, with wonder, expressions that belong to the period when philosophy was the handmaid of theology. For Merz materialism and agnosticism may be dangerous at times. The literature of thought which lacks the Anglo-Saxon restraint may be not only dangerous but evil. At the end of the chapters on the Unity of Thought and the Rationale of Thought the reader feels that the author is standing on the tower of an English cathedral looking for the philosophy that will again save God, immortality, and the freedom of the will, that will so reshape the world of science that the God of his fathers may return to it. And yet this is only a feeling Dr. Merz leaves with his readers, a feeling that attaches to the author rather than his work. It is a valiant undertaking to deal justly and sympathetically with all who have trod the speculative paths of his century.

*Selections from the Correspondence of the First Lord Acton.* Edited with an introduction by JOHN NEVILLE FIGGIS, Litt.D., and REGINALD VERE LAURENCE, M.A. Volume I. *Correspondence with Cardinal Newman, Lady Blennerhassett, W. E. Gladstone, and others.* (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1917. Pp. xx, 324. \$5.00.)

THE scholar who at his death, in 1902, passed for the most sphinx-like figure of his generation, bids fair to become the most amply known. Not that Lord Acton can ever be aught but "caviare to the general". The uniqueness of his family connections, his cosmopolitan training, the vastness of his erudition, the independence of his character, the unusual rôle due to his unusual equipment and his unusual convictions, will leave him still what he called himself—a man without contemporaries. But, if he remain a mystery, it will not be for lack of the products of his pen. True, during his lifetime he published not a single book—unless one count a pamphlet or two and his inaugural lecture at Cambridge. True, not a line seems ever to have been written of that great history of liberty which was to have been the chief fruit of his lifetime of study. But ever since his death the zeal of his friends has been giving the press fresh proofs of his fertility. Volume after volume the *Cambridge Modern History* which he planned attested the breadth of his historical vision and the alertness of his editorial choice. His Cambridge lectures furnished a volume on the French Revolution and a stimulating survey of all modern history. His scattered magazine articles and reviews, many of them heretofore anonymous, were ample for two volumes of historical essays and studies; and a bibliography compiled for the Royal Historical Society showed these but a part of a much larger output. Even his history of liberty proves to be represented not alone by the two popular lectures at Bridgnorth, long dimly known through local publication and French translation, but by a half-dozen more special studies which, with these, justified for one of the volumes of his essays the title of *The History of Freedom*.

But his literary executors had hardly entered on this series when in 1904 Herbert Paul opened another rich lode for our knowledge of Lord Acton by printing his letters to Mary Gladstone, the daughter of his old friend and political chief; and two years later Abbot (now Cardinal) Gasquet gave to the world, under the title of *Lord Acton and His Circle*, his correspondence with the Catholic scholars who had been associated with him in the production of the reviews—the *Rambler*, the *Home and Foreign Review*, the *Chronicle*, the *North British Review*—which absorbed his literary labors till the Vatican Council in 1870 changed the current and the channels of his life. With the present volume his literary executors themselves, his old pupils Figgis and Laurence, take up the editing of his correspondence. They have no thought of publishing it in full. They have chosen, they tell us, those letters which throw most

light on Acton's development. Even of what they give us they print often only fragments.

The Early Letters which form their first group begin in 1844, when the boy of ten wrote his mother from Wiseman's school at Oscott. Boyish enough they are, and not without a growing trace of priggishness, till at Munich, under the inspiration of Döllinger, he lost himself in love of learning and in the high purpose that thenceforth ennobled all his life. Already in 1854, pleading with his stepfather, Earl Granville, for a longer stay in Germany, we find him conscious of his mission as an interpreter to England of Continental scholarship—and already beginning to betray his interest in the history of liberty. The group of letters called Ecclesiastical Correspondence, beginning with fragments of his correspondence with Newman (already heavily drawn on by Ward for his *Life*), is richest in revelation for the history of the Vatican Council. The General Correspondence filling the remainder of the volume is mainly Acton's correspondence with Gladstone and with Lady Blennerhassett, but includes a letter from General Lee and two or three from Mandell Creighton.

The introduction of the editors is thoughtful and illuminating; but their foot-notes are too often a mechanical compilation from the biographical dictionaries. It would be hard to find a better illustration of what Creighton says to Acton of "the exceeding insularity" of English historical ideas than is offered by what these editors deem in need of explanation and by the explanations which they give—for it is only as to Continental scholars that they falter and trip. But we owe them a volume of rare worth for the religious and political history of the nineteenth century.

G. L. B.

*The Life of the Rt. Hon. Sir Charles W. Dilke, Bart., M.P.* Begun by STEPHEN GWYNN, M.P., completed and edited by GERTRUDE M. TUCKWELL. In two volumes. (London and New York: Macmillan Company. Pp. xix, 557; vi, 614. \$10.50.)

SIR CHARLES DILKE was in the front rank in political life in England for not more than seven years. He entered the House of Commons at the general election in 1868—the first election after the great extension of the franchise in 1867. It was 1878, however, before he had attained prominence in Parliament, and was nationally accepted as an exponent of radicalism. He was of only one administration—the Gladstone ministry of 1880–1885; and he was of the cabinet, as president of the Local Government Board, only from the end of 1882 until July, 1885. Then came the tragedy from which Dilke never fully recovered; for he himself admitted that, while he regained in the House of Commons the position that he had made between 1868 and 1878, he did not regain the position that he had held from 1878 to 1880 as an unofficial member,



and from 1880 to 1885 as a member of the Gladstone ministry. Moreover, much to his disappointment, he was not asked to become a member of the Campbell-Bannerman administration that was formed when the Unionists went out of office at the end of 1905.

Two large volumes, of nearly twelve hundred pages, seem at first glance out of proportion for so short a career in the front rank at Westminster and in the constituencies, especially when it is recalled that the biographies of Palmerston, Russell, Granville, Devonshire, Argyll, Goschen, and Forster run to no greater length. But no student of English politics from the second Reform Act to the Great War—no student who prefers to follow English politics in memoirs and letters rather than in the most detailed of political histories—will complain that there is a page too many in Mr. Stephen Gwynn and Miss Gertrude Tuckwell's biography of Dilke.

Dilke's career falls into three divisions. In the first was his careful preparation for political life, and his years in the House of Commons as an unofficial member. In the second was his tenure of the office of under-secretary for foreign affairs, with Granville as his chief; and next as president of the Local Government Board, and member of Gladstone's cabinet. In the third division was his election, in July, 1892, for the mining constituency of the Forest of Dean; and his subsequent continuous and active devotion to industrial and labor politics. The first and third divisions, as described in the Gwynn-Tuckwell pages, are of much interest and value—an interest which, in the case of the third division, will increase in view of the probability that after the war industrial politics will be essentially the domestic politics of England. These two divisions have also another special interest. No man who was ever of the House of Commons kept more constantly in touch with his constituency, or did more for the political education of his constituents, than Dilke. In this particular he was a model member of the House of Commons. It would not be inappropriate to describe him, so far as his relations with his constituents were concerned, as the Andrew Marvell of the reformed House of Commons. Dilke's relations with his constituents in the old London borough of Chelsea, where he was born and where he lived all his life, and also with his constituents in the Forest of Dean, are traced with informing detail, a detail that cannot fail to be appreciated by American students of English politics who are interested in national and local party organization, and in the comparison of the relations between members of Parliament and their constituents, and those between members of Congress and their constituents. One of the obvious values of the Dilke biography is the attention that has been bestowed on these relationships. In fact, it is not possible to recall a biography in which so much care has been taken with this aspect of British political life, except it be Mr. J. B. Mackie's admirable study of Campbell-Bannerman's forty years' connection with the Stirling boroughs.



But while Mr. Gwynn and Miss Tuckwell's work in telling the story of the first and third divisions of Dilke's career has so much to commend it, it is the second division of his life—the years from 1880 to 1885—that give to the biography its chief value to students of English constitutional and parliamentary history. For these years the biography is based, for the most part, on Dilke's correspondence, and on a memoir which he himself prepared. The history of these years is revealing to an extent that is remarkable, even when it is recalled how much there is that is revealing in the Monypenny-Buckle life of Disraeli, and in the three volumes of the Benson and Esher's *Letters of Queen Victoria from 1837 to 1861*. Had there been no catastrophe in Dilke's life, and had his memoir been written throughout with the frankness that characterizes his history of the Gladstone administration of 1880–1885, the Dilke biography would have been the most revealing of political biographies of the era from 1832 to 1914. As it is, for the period covered—1880–1885—there is no biography or memoir of any member of Gladstone's cabinet of those years which can be compared with it.

The most important revelation is as to the extent and frequency of Queen Victoria's interference in politics until at least as late as Gladstone's second administration. Dilke himself was the occasion of some of this interference; for in his earlier years in the House of Commons he had incurred the displeasure of the queen by his platform utterances in favor of republicanism, and also by his attitude in Parliament towards the civil list. As early as 1879, before Dilke began his short and abruptly terminated official career, Beaconsfield predicted that he would be Gladstone's successor as Liberal prime minister. Gladstone in 1882 regarded Dilke as the best-equipped man in the Liberal party to succeed him as leader. But in November of that year, when Gladstone was about to transfer Dilke from the Foreign Office to the Local Government Board, with a seat in the cabinet, Grosvenor, the ministerial whip in the House of Commons, who was probably as well-informed as his chief, was uncertain how the queen would regard Dilke's promotion to cabinet rank. Grosvenor asked Dilke if he thought that the queen was willing that he should be of the cabinet.

I said [reads Dilke's note of the interview] that so far as I knew the trouble was at an end. He replied that he had two accounts of it. Harcourt told him that both the Prince of Wales and Prince Leopold had said that the Queen had made up her mind to take me; but Hartington said that she had told him a different story. I said I did not know which was right; but she could take me or leave me, for not another word would I say.

Dilke in 1882 was acceptable to the queen; but the episode in his life that led to his partial retirement for seven years after 1885 saved Queen Victoria from being confronted with the republican of 1871 as prime minister, when the Liberals were returned to power at the general election of 1892, and Gladstone retired in March, 1894. Dilke's appearance

in the divorce court in 1886 threatened political life in England with a loss comparable with that sustained when Huskisson was killed at the opening of the Manchester and Liverpool Railway in 1830. But to the end of his life in 1910, as the Gwynn-Tuckwell biography recalls, Dilke acted in accordance with the plan he drew up for himself when he left Cambridge in 1866. "My aim in life", he then wrote, in an intimate letter to his brother, Ashton Dilke, "is to be of the greatest use I can to the world at large, not because that is my duty, but because that is the course which will make my life happiest." He did much useful work—much to help the coming time—in and out of Parliament in the years when there was no longer a place for him either on the Treasury bench or the front opposition bench in the House of Commons.

Dilke's interest in labor and industrial politics dated back to his first term in the House of Commons as member for Chelsea; and when he again became an unofficial member in 1892—this time as the representative of a mining constituency—it was no forced change for him to throw himself completely into industrial politics. More immediate and more obvious successes were his fortune in the industrial field than in the official work that occupied him from 1880 to 1885. If the Liberal party of the twenty years that preceded the war lost much by the tragedy of 1885-1886, the movement toward better industrial and social conditions gained enormously by Dilke's transference of his activities. He did much to forward the establishment of the old age pension system on a non-contributory basis. He achieved outstanding successes in drastic legislation for dealing with dangerous trades and sweated industries; and the Labor party of 1906-1914, in its legislative achievements, owed much to the continuous assistance it received from Dilke.

Dilke's was not a conventional political career. It was not possible for him after 1886 to continue along the conventional lines that he followed from 1880 to 1885. His career, none the less, was one of the most interesting of those of the men who came to the front in the reign of Queen Victoria; and his biographers are to be congratulated on their production of a book that has a value as abiding as that of almost any of the great political biographies of the period from the first Reform Act to the Great War.

EDWARD PORRITT.

*Recollections.* By JOHN, Viscount MORLEY, O.M. In two volumes. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1917. Pp. x, 388; vi, 382. \$7.50.)

THESE volumes are given to a world which is intensely preoccupied. We think much about the Junkers and not a little about the Bolsheviks, but the enlightened, high-minded Liberals of whom Lord Morley writes are consigned for the moment to a vague and shadowy background. Would that it were otherwise! But facts will not budge. Whoever

takes up a book nowadays either finds it filled with the War or at once proceeds to translate it into terms of the War—that is to say into his own terms of the War. Here, however, one is reminded of Matthew Arnold's lines on Wordsworth:

The cloud of mortal destiny,  
Others may front it fearlessly—  
But who, like him, will put it by?

So it is with Lord Morley and the War. He "puts it by"—at least in the sense of disregarding it. The era of which he writes may not have been the Golden Age as sung by Virgil at the close of the Second Georgic, but under the aspect which it wears in these pages the Victorian period was, relatively speaking, a time of philosophic calm—*necdum etiam audierant inflari classica*. Even the debates on Gladstonian Home Rule seem academic when compared with the Retreat from Mons and the defence of the Ypres Salient.

Some observations of this character are needed to emphasize the fact that Lord Morley in touching upon the high points of his long and exceptional career speaks to a world which is steeped to saturation in affairs of its own. Hence where many would have given full attention to this work five years ago, the number of its attentive readers today is likely to be much smaller than one could wish. Since to Lord Morley himself temperament and years have long since brought the philosophic mind, he will be the last to expect his reminiscences to hold the centre of the stage for a season as did his *Life of Gladstone*. At the same time it would be most unfortunate if war cares and interests were to crowd out such a record as this from the attention of those whose horizon is wider than the concerns of a single twelvemonth, lustrum, or decade.

It is a great thing to have been for a full generation the Aristides of English public life; and moreover in that time no one could have been found to vote for Lord Morley's ostracism on the ground that his robust honesty was too obtrusive. His phrase about Chamberlain's genius for friendship is at least equally apt in its application to himself. Those who know anything about his part in British politics are fully seized of the fact that he was never a cross-bench man. If at the moment when he entered the House of Commons some may have prophesied for him the futilities of a doctrinaire, his thirty years of active partizanship prove that he was willing to put his brains into joint stock with those of other people. But while he stuck to the organization and made clear-cut speeches on the West Meath Election he won to an uncommon degree the liking as well as the respect of all the public men whose friendship was worth having.

It is important to lay stress upon these two things: the intensity of Morley's interest in politics and the rare quality of his friendships. These are facts which stand out from his *Recollections* in the highest of high relief. Indeed the concluding words of his Introduction couple

these two motives in a manner which is strikingly characteristic. "Much of my ground obviously involves others; deeply should I regret if a single page were found unfair or likely to wound just sensibilities. More deeply still should I deplore, if a single page or phrase or passing mood of mine were either to dim the lamp of loyalty to Reason, or to dishearten earnest and persistent zeal for wise politics, in younger readers with their lives before them." This last is his selected epigraph and in his reference to the just sensibilities of others may be seen that considerateness which is so large and so essential an element in friendship. And then there is the "loyalty to Reason" which existed before he met Mill, which was stimulated by his contact with Mill, which shines out in his tractate on *Compromise* and was throughout his lode-star.

These, then, are the materials out of which Lord Morley's life has been compacted and which furnish the stuff for his *Recollections*: a willingness to advance in whatever direction was indicated by Reason; a burning interest in public affairs, to some extent as a game but essentially as representing the means by which the lives of millions might be enlarged through the introduction of liberal and humane measures; and that warmth of sympathy which invites, or rather which compels, friendship. Any autobiography which covers two volumes is to some extent a labyrinth, but with the clues just indicated the reader of Lord Morley's *Recollections* will find his way about quite easily.

Approached from another angle this work is a record of persistent, unflagging energy. At no stage has Lord Morley loitered. Whether as man of letters, parliamentarian, or executive, he has given himself without stint to the task at hand, cultivating his garden by the most intensive methods. Every advanced community can show among its intellectuals certain handsome and luxuriant foliage plants, and for such in reasonable quantities there is a due place. But the labors of Lord Morley have been essentially fruitful. It is meritorious to be learned, or to write well, or to speak well, or to be a useful administrator. The combination in one man of all these qualifications not only implies high natural faculty but rigorous discipline. Following Bacon's classic phrase a several and important training is to be gained through reading, writing, and conference. It has been the rare experience of Lord Morley to illustrate what can be done by those who know how to use in the forum the sources of strength which they derive from the closet.

In these volumes his record of youthful days is scant, embracing no more than a characterization of his father and brief sketches of the men he knew at Oxford—particularly Thomas Fowler, Overton, and Cotter Morison. On leaving Lincoln College at twenty-two he became a journalist in London. 1860 was a fine date at which to advance from the University to the larger school of the world, and one of the most striking chapters in the whole work—a chapter entitled the Spirit of the Time—is devoted to the intellectual forces then at work. Thrown into the thick of London Morley at once proved that he could hold his own

with the pen, and quickly established two of his most important friendships, those with George Meredith and John Stuart Mill. At the same time he was drawing intellectual and moral stimulus from the Continent—from Comte, Victor Hugo, Mazzini, and George Sand.

Equipped for the rôle by solid reading and first-hand thinking, Morley became a real leader of public opinion when he succeeded G. H. Lewes as editor of the *Fortnightly Review*. During the Seventies this periodical made itself felt very widely as an organ of humane and sympathetic rationalism. Lord Morley tells us that from Comte he learned "to do justice to truths presented and services rendered by men in various schools, with whom in important and even in vital respects I could not in the least bring myself to agree". This catholicity of spirit was reflected in the *Fortnightly*, for while its contributors could fight hard round the carroccio they were not on the whole very free from self-righteousness and intellectual vanity. During this same period Morley wrote his books on Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot, besides sounding the clarion note which runs through his "little volume" on *Compromise*. Of his friendships with other leading Liberals there is a graphic record in the full-length portraits which he gives of Herbert Spencer, Leslie Stephen, Henry Sidgwick, and Matthew Arnold.

The life of Cobden (1881), soon followed by the editorship of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, marks the transition by which Morley passed from letters to politics, but the real bridge between these distinct periods of his life is represented by the firm, enduring friendship which he formed with Joseph Chamberlain. This began in 1873, and as the bonds of intimacy strengthened Morley found himself impelled towards public life by the development of latent aptitudes and by a new sense of apostleship. To those who are familiar with his writings without knowing much about the details of his life, the depth of his fondness for Chamberlain may come with some surprise. In any case it seems unlikely that Chamberlain should ever be presented under a more attractive guise than that which he wears in these volumes.

Without going into such detail as is beyond the scope of the present notice, it would be impossible to comment at all properly upon the political labors of Lord Morley. Here the two landmarks are, of course, Ireland and India. But one who was for thirty years a leading figure in Parliament accumulates reminiscences which go far before the range of his own special activities. On the whole the political data which are furnished in these pages will be found to possess their chief value from the light which they cast on Morley's own mentality and aspirations. Dicey has said that aristocracy emphasizes the differences between men while democracy lays stress upon the resemblances. Morley, with no foolish prejudices against the well-born, has been a staunch democrat from the depth and fervor of his sympathy with the common lot. Alike as Chief Secretary for Ireland and at the India Office he showed the spirit of a constructive statesman who shaped his acts to accord with a disinterested and lofty standard.

To comment briefly upon a work so filled with suggestion, so crowded with notable figures, and so instinct with the author's personality is to accept a contradiction in terms, but at least a finger-post can be set up which will point towards a remarkable record. There are those whose historical interests centre in the emergence and development of ideas. A still larger number look upon history as past politics. But however historians may group themselves with respect to their dominant interests, no one can deny the high importance of Lord Morley's *Recollections* unless he deliberately excludes from his interests the life and thought of England during the past century.

Best of all there are here revealed the lineaments of a statesman who shared Turgot's sympathy for the common man, and who was willing to follow the argument wherever it might lead.

C. W. COLBY.

*L'Empereur Frédéric III. (1831-1888).* By HENRI WELSCHINGER, de l'Institut de France. [Bibliothèque d'Histoire Contemporaine.] (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1917. Pp. xii, 335. 5 fr.)

M. HENRI WELSCHINGER, who has already published a biography of Bismarck, essays in this volume to show some of the effects of the chancellor's policy of blood and iron. This policy was, from the beginning, distasteful to the Crown Prince Frederick, who alone among the Hohenzollerns succumbed to the liberal tradition of England; Bismarck, hating this liberalism, systematically excluded him from any real share in the government of Prussia and Germany; in the short reign of ninety-nine days in 1888 the issue was fairly joined between Frederick and the "loyal servant of William I.", and the death of the former before he could inaugurate a less autocratic régime left the Bismarckian system triumphant, ready to the hand of William II. All this is well known, but there is a real interest in having it summarized, for "how much would the destinies of Europe probably have been changed if he who was called by his people 'Frederick the Noble' had been able to reign as long as William I., to show the full measure of his talents, and to give effect to his generous intentions" (p. ii).

In a volume of more than three hundred pages, only 123 are devoted to the life of Frederick III., of which four suffice to describe his activities from 1871 to 1878. In his account of the emperor's last illness, M. Welschinger follows entirely the narrative of Sir Morell Mackenzie and uses the counterblasts of the German physicians only to disclose their jealousy. The second part of the book contains the most important passages of the Crown Prince's *Diary* for 1870-1871, and this leads on to an illuminating narrative of Bismarck's judicial proceedings against Geffcken for publishing it in the *Deutsche Rundschau*. M. Welschinger thinks that the chancellor's failure to secure Geffcken's conviction had momentous consequences: William II. had accepted the Bismarckian

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—41.



tradition of statecraft as his own; on the other hand, the "infallibility" of that system had been successfully assailed, and his enemies were not slow to take their advantage. In short the incident facilitated the dismissal of Bismarck a year later.

M. Welschinger has used the standard lives of the emperor, and quotes at some length, but foot-notes and references are generally lacking. He makes a curious slip in the opening paragraph when he calls his hero the nephew of Frederick William III., who is described as childless. The style is often impassioned, as the author grows indignant over the policies of William II. and the conduct of the Germans in the present war, both of which are repeatedly contrasted with the liberal and humane ideas of Frederick III. Taken as a whole, the narrative selections provide a useful and adequate biography of a very sympathetic figure.

There are ten appendixes, of which the first is a summary of *The Empress Frederick*, published in 1913. Another contains the Crown Prince's journal of his visit to Palestine in 1869, where he was moved by religious feeling rather than impressed by political possibilities, as Prince Hohenlohe had been a decade earlier. For the rest, there are various judgments of Bismarck and a discussion of the immediate responsibility for the War of 1914. Such material has no place in a life of Frederick III., however much it may set off his noble character against the sinister figures of Bismarck and William II. Indeed, even in the text, M. Welschinger has allowed rather too much of the propagandist spirit to creep in, and it is to be regretted that he did not confine himself to the proper function of a biographer. A short bibliography is appended, and there is an index of proper names.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

*A Guide to Diplomatic Practice.* By the Rt. Hon. Sir ERNEST SATOW, G.C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L. In two volumes. [Contributions to International Law and Diplomacy, edited by L. Oppenheim, M.A., LL.D.] (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1917. Pp. ix, 405; xxi, 407. \$9.00.)

THE author of the present work has had a long and honorable career in the public service. Setting out as a student-interpreter in Japan, in 1861, he eventually came to occupy, after holding various posts in other parts of the world, the position of envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary at Tokio, and later served in a similar capacity at Peking. From 1906, when he was sworn a privy councillor, till 1912 he was one of the British members of the permanent court of arbitration at the Hague. Meanwhile, in 1907, he acted as a British plenipotentiary at the Second Peace Conference at that capital. In treating of diplomatic practice, he therefore enjoys the advantage of writing on a subject on which his experience has made him an authority. The practical diplo-



matist, however, seldom has occasion to study his profession systematically from the historical and scientific point of view, and the results are of special interest when he undertakes such a task.

The volumes before us contain a copious collection of pertinent matter, interspersed with judicious and helpful comments. In the opening sections, however, the distinction is not made so clear as it perhaps might have been between diplomacy and diplomatics, nor is mention made of Dom Mabillon's epochal treatise on the latter subject, *De Re Diplomatica* (1681), the sumptuous third edition of which, published at Naples in 1789, is now before me. Moreover, general conclusions are sometimes expressed in terms which associate them with a particular form of government—the parliamentary form—more strictly than may have been intended. When the author deprecates (I. 141) direct exchanges between the heads of states, without the knowledge and concurrence of the minister of foreign affairs, as likely to result in misunderstandings, possibly he expresses a view universally valid; but when he says that this “cannot occur . . . in a constitutional state”, and condemns the practice of carrying on secret diplomacy “behind the back of the responsible minister”, he is evidently thinking of parliamentary governments, just as he is when he affirms that the proper person to blame for a weak or unintelligent diplomacy is “the Secretary of State, or Minister for Foreign Affairs”. He adds that “sometimes, in autocratic governments, the responsibility lies on the sovereign”. Whether he would class a government as autocratic merely because it was, like the United States, non-parliamentary in form, does not appear. Probably he would not do so; and when, further on (I. 9), in speaking of the United States, he remarks that “the authority of the President predominates in foreign affairs (as in all other matters)”, it is not to be assumed that he was thinking exclusively of the form or contents of the Constitution.

In at least one instance he attributes to the word “sovereign” an importance which it does not possess. After stating that a “sovereign”, when travelling abroad, is exempt from the local jurisdiction, he observes that “nothing seems to have been decided as to the position of the President of a Republic, when in the territories of another State”; but he intimates that “no head of a republic would expose himself to the risk of being refused the immunities accorded to a sovereign”, and that, when a president visits a foreign state, “he either expects to receive, or has been promised beforehand, treatment in all respects the same as that of a sovereign”. This is all very strange, and it would indeed be remarkable to find a case in which the president of a republic had stipulated beforehand for the extraterritoriality which a “sovereign” confessedly enjoys. In reality the question whether the chief executive is a “sovereign” or a president is in this respect quite immaterial. It is not by reason of the fact that he is the one or the other that he enjoys the immunity; it is solely by reason of the fact that he is the head of a sovereign state.

In the treatment of some subjects, such as that of presents to diplomatic officers (I. 356-363), and the termination of missions (I. 365-407), where even a simple chronological development would have been helpful, there are indications that the author lacked full opportunity for the analysis and scientific arrangement of his materials. The same thing is true of his discussion of mediation and good offices (II. 289 *et seq.*). The author, after expressing the opinion that the two processes are "essentially distinct in character", and referring to the Hague convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes, which, as he correctly observes, makes no distinction between them, quotes, on the one hand, Pearce Higgins, who regards the difference as "more theoretical than practical", and, on the other hand, Oppenheim, who undertakes to make the distinction that a power, when using "good offices", "does not itself take part in the negotiations", whereas a mediator "is the middleman who does take part in the negotiations". In reality, it would hardly be useful to espouse either view, nor would the authorities cited wholly sustain either of them, in the terms in which they are here respectively set forth. The highest authorities often apply first the one title and then the other indiscriminately to the same proceeding, and it will hardly do to say that they are wrong, since the best usage has not strictly reserved either title for a single definite and distinctive form of procedure. The most one can say is that it would be desirable to make certain precise distinctions, and then to adhere to them. "Mediation" has no doubt been used to denote certain formal procedures which "good offices" would not properly describe: *e. g.*, the procedure formerly common, of conducting negotiations, as at Münster and elsewhere, indirectly through "mediators", instead of directly between the plenipotentiaries; also, the formal submission of a point in dispute to a third party, who, because he is invested with power only to make a recommendation, and not to render a final decision, acts, not as an arbitrator, but as a "mediator", one of the most striking modern examples of such submission, which the author does not mention, being that of the dispute between Germany and Spain as to the Caroline Islands to His Holiness the pope. On the other hand, the inadmissibility of the test that the power using good offices "does not itself take part in the negotiations" is at once demonstrated by the universal and approved application of the term to the care of the interests of the citizens of a country which has no diplomatic or consular representative on the spot. In this common instance, the function of the power using its "good offices" is precisely that of conducting the negotiations. Moreover, mediation is confused with a radically different process, when (II. 358) "arbitration" is said to be "essentially" the conferring upon a "mediator", instead of "a commission to negotiate terms of settlement", the "more extended power of pronouncing a judgment". The fact that an arbitration might follow or even result from a mediation would not make the

one process a part of or an extension of the other; and in reality they are rarely connected, although in the Dogger Bank case they were combined without being confused. Nor does the history of arbitration bear out the statement that it will "on the whole" be employed only "where the subject-matter . . . is of comparative unimportance". The presence or absence of a desire for an amicable settlement is, however, as the author observes, a factor of great moment.

In several instances reliance upon secondary sources has resulted in the perpetuation of erroneous impressions. The author (I. 272) correctly invokes the authority of Calvo for the statement that the United States once asked for the recall of the Dutch minister because he refused to appear and submit himself to cross-examination as a witness in a criminal case, even though in so refusing he followed the instructions of his government. Whence Calvo derived this singular impression does not appear, since his citations refute it. Likewise, the statement, for which American authority is adduced (I. 196), that the United States "adheres to its ancient rule" in declining to inquire in advance as to the personal acceptability of diplomatic representatives below the grade of ambassador, is not in accord with existing practice, it having for some years past been the rule also to make such inquiries in regard to appointees below that grade. That Anson Burlingame did not come to the United States as a "special ambassador" (I. 198) is shown by his description, in the treaty which he signed at Washington, as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary. The supposition (I. 334) that the note of Mr. Fish to Baron Gerolt, to which Bismarck replied on January 15, 1871, regarding the delivery of despatch bags during the siege of Paris, "has not been printed", seems to have occasioned a surmise that it was withheld because its contentions were abandoned; the note was, however, dated, not "a month before", but on November 21, 1870, and was printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1871 (p. 401). The account of Lord Sackville's case (I. 386) is quite accurate; but in estimating the comment, quoted from an unfriendly American source (I. 388), upon Mr. Bayard's "unseemly haste", we may, while admitting that Sackville's prompt dismissal presupposed a weakness in the electorate fully as deplorable as his lordship's inept letter, bear in mind that responsibility for the decision may have rested quite as much with the President as with the Secretary of State; that the President could hardly have been unacquainted with the prevalent belief that Blaine's defeat four years before was due to his failure immediately to rebuke Burchard's unfortunate alliteration; and that, if agitated voters could be convinced and held only by the minister's dismissal, it had to precede the election. As the same President on another occasion remarked, it was "a condition not a theory" that confronted him. That the condition might have been adequately met by a public appeal to common sense is a supposition which experts will not unanimously indulge.

It is our impression that the French noun *national*, now so generally used in diplomatic correspondence (I. 167), is potentially more comprehensive than the English words "subject or citizen"; and the view based upon the authority of some writers, that the right of embassy "is a matter of *comity*, and not of *strict right*" (I. 180), may be open to interpretation. From the statement (I. 106) that, "before the signature of a treaty", it is "the rule that the full powers of the plenipotentiaries must be exhibited for the purpose of verification", the inference doubtless was not intended to be drawn that the examination is usually deferred till the treaty is ready to be signed; since on important occasions, and particularly in the case of special plenipotentiaries, the preliminary examination of the full powers is only a prudent precaution, as is shown by notable examples in recent as well as in earlier years. Those who may be disposed superficially to jeer or to "chortle" at Jefferson's rule of *pêle-mêle* as an attempt to carry democracy to excess may do well to note (I. 19, 237; II. 35, 43, 70, 71, 79) the frequency with which that rule was adopted by monarchical governments, as little chargeable with popular proclivities as was that of Louis XV. In narrating former disputes as to precedence (I. 20-21) the fact might have been noted that the action of Pombal in establishing a new rule at Lisbon was recited in France's declaration of war against Portugal in 1762. It hardly speaks well for the progressive purification of diplomacy that the author reaches the conclusion that "the law of nations is not concerned with bribery"; that it is "a question of morality alone"; and that, "since every government provides itself with a secret service fund, it is evident that the practice of purchasing secret information is more or less universal". Whether those who inveigh against "secret diplomacy" will feel reassured by this intimation, will depend upon their point of view.

The reviewer, vividly recalling the circumstance that, at the first civil service examination for admission to the Department of State, at Washington, the candidates, of whom he happened to be one, were asked to state the number of square miles in France, regrets that the commissioners of that day could not have had the benefit of the author's opinion (I. 184) that, in the education of a diplomatist, "geography, beyond elementary notions, is not of great value", and that he "will acquire what geographical knowledge he needs of the country to which he is appointed while residing at his post". Although opinions may differ as to what the "elementary notions" of geography may embrace, the reviewer is confident that the phrase was not intended to include the superficial area of the various countries of the world; and in this belief he is glad to acknowledge, with fraternal warmth and gratitude, the retrospective consolation which he derives from the author's view.

J. B. MOORE

*Les Races et les Nationalités en Autriche-Hongrie.* Par BERTRAND AUERBACH, Professeur à l'Université de Nancy. [Bibliothèque d'Histoire Contemporaine.] Deuxième édition. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1917. Pp. ix, 492. 10 fr.)

THE first edition of Professor Auerbach's work on the nationalities of Austria-Hungary appeared in 1898. The second edition was ready for the press at the outbreak of the war, and the author's facts and conclusions have lost neither in interest nor in permanent value by events since that time. One still turns to his volume as the most authoritative contribution to the literature of his subject in any language. At home in the fields of history, geography, ethnology, and linguistics, and possessed of a philosophic spirit of inquiry, he discusses political questions without partizan bias. His method of treatment enables him to present the complex aspects of any one nationality without endangering the unity of the subject as a whole.

After a general survey, each nationality reappears under each province or group of provinces. The author thus makes it clear that, for instance, the Ruthenians of Galicia, in their struggles with the Poles, pursue other aims than the Ruthenians of Bukowina, who there find themselves threatened by Ruman. And the Ruman of that province, in their turn, are confronted by other problems than the Ruman of Transylvania. In no other European state is it so necessary for the scientific or political observer to be on his guard in coming to conclusions based on racial and linguistic grounds. Again and again he must ask, what race and what language? Some nationalities, like the Slovene, are an anthropological puzzle. In the matter of language the difficulty may be equally great. The local vocabularies of the Alpine valleys of German Austria tell their own bewildering tale. Not seldom the ethnic or historic origin of a German or Slavic *enclave* in an Austrian or Hungarian province is lost in obscurity. The Germans of Carniola are becoming steadily denationalized and adopt the Slovene tongue. Anthropology throws little light on their ancestry. Physically and dialectically the German of Carniola differs from his kinsman in neighboring Carinthia. Such considerations have their important bearing on the political questions of the day.

The Italian claim to southern Tyrol is supposed to rest firmly on linguistic, ethnic, and historic grounds. Does the claim justly include the Ladins of the remote valleys of the Adige? Their language links them as closely to the French, Spanish, and Ruman, as it does to the Italian. Ethnically there is doubt as to whether they are descendants of Etruscans, Ligurians, or Celts. The cities of southern Tyrol have not always borne their present physiognomy. Bozen is to all appearances to-day a German town; in the Middle Ages it was chiefly Italian. The Germans appeared in the Trentino first in the thirteenth century. There was little intermingling of nationalities for three centuries. Montaigne, in

1580, described Trent as a town half-divided between two languages. To-day its characteristics are Italian. Bohemia presents still more perplexing problems. In spite of their political antagonisms, Czechs and Teutons bear a baffling physical resemblance, which leaves a doubt as to whether the Slavic or the German type predominates. Again, the persistence of common physical characteristics is in strange contrast to linguistic changes which take place under the eyes of the present generation. The reactionary Princes Schwarzenberg, perhaps the most powerful aristocrats of all Europe, are identifying themselves more and more, linguistically, with the Czechs, though their loyalty to the Hapsburgs is as unaltered as that of the liberal-German Auerspergs. Entire Bohemian cities have changed their linguistic and political complexion in recent days. In 1850 Pilsen was a German town. Of its 15,000 inhabitants 3000 or 4000 were Czechs. To-day, of its 70,000 inhabitants the overwhelming majority are Czechs. Budweis has fared similarly. In Vienna itself the Slavic propaganda, though not expressed in figures, is steadily gaining ground. And the German-speaking population, while bitterly opposed to the Slavs, is far from being in sympathy, alike in peace and war, with the Teutonism of Berlin. Again, anthropologically and linguistically—as far as the spoken language is concerned—the differences between the German of Vienna and the German of Berlin are as marked as the resemblances.

Few foreign observers have laid such stress as Professor Auerbach, directly and indirectly, on the need of weighing all the factors entering into a discussion of Magyar chauvinism, the claims of Poles, the aspirations of South Slavs, but for these and similar subjects now agitating the world we must refer the reader to his own pages. In conclusion, we shall only add that it is a rare pleasure to notice the scrupulous accuracy in the spelling of foreign names which distinguishes this notable volume. We have found only one disturbing misprint: the statement (on p. 259) that the Jews of Galicia number *one* (instead of ten) per cent. of the total population. The only serious defect of the book is the lack of an index.

GUSTAV POLLAK.

*Der Kampf um die Vermeidung des Weltkriegs: Randglossen aus zwei Jahrzehnten zu den Zeitereignissen vor der Katastrophe (1892-1900 und 1907-1914).* Von BERTHA VON SUTTNER. Herausgegeben von Dr. ALFRED H. FRIED. In two volumes. (Zürich: Orell Füssli. 1917. Pp. xx, 628; xvi, 630. 16 fr.)

FROM October, 1892, to the summer of 1900, and again from January, 1907, until a month before her death in 1914 (June 21), Baroness Bertha von Suttner wrote "from week to week and month to month" a fairly continuous record of political events. She made abstracts of speeches; quoted significant sentences, and fused the story of it all in the setting



of her own comment. The personality of the writer is revealed in her criticisms, but otherwise there is but little of a personal nature in these portly volumes, until one reaches the pages which tell of her travels in the United States. These are filled chiefly with letters to Dr. Fried. The total result is, as Dr. Fried says, not history but the raw material of history. The value placed upon such material will depend chiefly upon one's estimate of the importance of the Baroness von Suttner's judgments of men and things.

Dr. Fried has evidently labored patiently over this mass of condensed summaries of news-items in a spirit of enthusiastic admiration for his departed friend, and in the belief that her outlook upon her own age will have a permanent value for a future time. He was avowedly moved by a desire to execute a commission which she had entrusted to him and also to produce a suitable memorial to her life-work for world-peace.

The title here given to her marginal notes on contemporary life is of Dr. Fried's choosing, and in an epilogue to the second volume he points out that his *Diary of the War*, published in *Friedens-Warte* since August, 1914, is substantially a continuation of the baroness's chronicle of the events leading towards this Armageddon.

The first outstanding impression derived from this moving picture of politics is that the baroness placed every event and every actor always under one searchlight, that which came from the idea behind the title of her most famous book, *Die Waffen Nieder*. That idea possessed her completely. By it all her contemporaries were measured. The years in which she collected these memoranda were the years of the Venezuela dispute, the two Hague Conferences, the Morocco controversy and the Balkan Wars. She was quick to appraise the bearing of all events and policies upon the cause dear to her heart, and she appraised them with accuracy and foresight. She perceived that the English Edward was a preserver of peace, and that the German Wilhelm, whose contradictory qualities she well described as "ultra-modern and ultra-feudal", was not to be implicitly trusted when he posed as a pacifist. Therefore although at first sight these pages look like a fragmentary chronicle, a heap of disconnected facts, a closer scrutiny shows an underlying unity in these scraps; it is in the constant factor of the movement towards an organized world and against the mailed fist. So the baroness's note-books, while conveying no information that is new, may have some value as a witness to a long and unswerving effort.

To an American the naïve and minute confidences in the letters written during Baroness von Suttner's visit here in 1912 are sometimes interesting as gossip, although the reason for such unrestricted publication is not evident. It is worth noting, however, that in the spring of 1914, having in mind the repeal of the Panama toll-exemption clause, she placed this estimate upon President Wilson: "He has introduced morals into politics".



Dr. Fried has contributed to the work a name-index and a subject-index, which seem reasonably adequate. His English proof-reading has made at least one curious blunder (II. 431), where "the pulsied month of war" remotely suggests a "palsied mouth".

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

*Das Völkerringen 1914/15.* Von F. M. KIRCHEISEN. Mit Aktenstücken. Erster (Text-)Band. (Aarau: H. R. Sauerländer. 1915. Pp. xx, 567. 8 marks.)

THIS volume is part of a pretentious history of the war, on the large scale of those of Allen and Simonds now being published. The author, who is a native of Saxony, has long resided in Geneva, which may account for some of his views, and even for the clear and simple prose which he writes. He makes books easily and quickly, but I judge also without much research, with little insight, and no depth of thought. While these pages contain much of interest to him who would read the details, they present few important additions to our knowledge of the subject, little to explain what is not evident already, few generalizations, or summaries, or wise remarks. The plan stated is to make use of official or semi-official documents and the best information obtainable from trustworthy sources among all the belligerent peoples. Actually the work consists in large part of lengthy extracts from newspapers, German and Swiss. True, a *Documentenhalbband* was issued along with this volume, but it is not to be obtained here yet. From what is before me I should conjecture that in it the author uses his texts with such acumen and fairness as intelligent German propagandists have displayed in this country.

The writing is not by one blinded with feeling of superiority or lust for power, but from a kindly gentleman who seems to desire to be fair. In his judgment France is "das aufgeklärteste und demokratischste Land Europas". But even from such a one we find no admission that in any way was Germany to blame for the war, or that any of her deeds have been more than little transgressions justified by evil conditions. In mild simplicity he follows zu Reventlow's school: since the fall of Napoleon England has woven a net about the world so that all men must labor for her and all the world's riches be hers; when Germany resisted, England grew hostile; Edward VII., envious of his nephew, made the Entente Cordiale, rendering France subservient, and then drew along Russia; thus was Germany encircled. He thinks that the measures of Austria-Hungary against Servia were just; the direct cause of the war was the declaration of July 24 that in a conflict between Austria and Servia, Russia could not be indifferent; the Russian ruling classes needed a successful war to regain their vanished prestige; the Allies prepared to attack, Russia really making the first declaration of war; envy of German greatness was one of the major causes.

Most of this is contained in the brief introduction. The bulk of the volume consists of detailed narration, long extracts from journals, and proclamations reprinted. There are the eighteen declarations of war and explanatory documents accompanying. There is a long chapter on the mobilization, which gives little about questions of priority or order, but a great deal of interesting information, largely from newspapers, on the movement of troops and experiences of people. There is a short, worthless account of the military resources and strength of the warring powers. There are finally three chapters on the course of the war itself: the most detailed story which I have seen of the fighting between Austria and Servia and Montenegro; an excellent and interesting account of the invasion of Belgium; and a minute relation of the battles between Frenchmen and Germans in Alsace-Lorraine. All this is evidently not by a military writer. There are few generalizations of value, and the treatment, entirely narrative, is such that the difficult questions are not even brought to attention. After perusal we are as much in the dark as ever why the French made their offensive into the Reichsland, and why they failed; only incidentally do we notice how much Austria's advantage against her small Slavic enemies was owing to superior artillery.

Some things almost make one doubt the good faith of the author, but I am convinced that they result from honest incapacity, and, probably, too great haste. For us this book possesses greater interest and importance than it would otherwise have, because it is one of the very few books on the war by a German which has come to this country.

EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER.

*The Marne Campaign.* By Major F. E. WHITTON. [Campaigns and their Lessons, edited by Maj.-Gen. C. E. Callwell, C.B.] (London: Constable; Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1917. Pp. xv, 311. \$4.00.)

MAJOR WHITTON'S careful and highly intelligent study of the Marne campaign of 1914 frankly admits that many matters relating to it remain obscure. A half-century after the American Civil War, for all the wealth of evidence in the shape of orders, despatches, reports, and explanatory comment, some of our war myths are still in the process of being cleared away. The battle of the Marne gave rise to a persistent myth, widely circulated in American newspapers on January 9, 1918, in the announcement of the death of General Grossetti, commander of the 42d Division of the Ninth French Army. Major Whitton punctures this particular myth by showing that the Ninth French Army drove no wedge into the Teutonic centre, that there was no movement resembling such a thrust made by the Ninth Army, that this army had been roughly handled and forced back on September 9, that the widely vaunted movement of the 42d Division made slight progress, and that the Germans

were waiting for the orders to attack when the general order to retire the entire German line arrived. Major Whitton's book opens with a summary of the army organizations and naval forces of the different countries at the outset of the war. He analyzes the military movements in Belgium, France, Russia, Austria-Hungary, Serbia, and elsewhere from the time of the German onrush to the Seine up to the retirement to the Aisne. He gives also a digest of operations on the ocean and even of the war movements in Africa. The Russian campaign into East Prussia, of course, had a direct effect upon the battle of the Marne, compelling the Germans to divert troops from the West to the East, but the relation to the Marne campaign of some of the military movements described by the author is not so obvious.

There has been much curiosity to know what was the German objective in August and September, 1914, what checked the onrush, and especially what happened to General von Kluck. Major Whitton's view is that the French army and not Paris was the main objective, a view that accords with both military and common sense. Moreover the perimeter of the forts encircling Paris exceeded eighty miles, and a much larger force than von Kluck had at his disposal would have been necessary for investment and siege operations.

The rapid advance of the Germans in August and September, which the author compares favorably with the best of Napoleon's movements, separated von Kluck from the next German army on his left, and between these armies there was a gap of some forty miles. To close up this gap on September 3, the southerly advance of von Kluck was changed to a southeastwardly movement across the enemy's front, here held by the badly hustled British force, which, apparently, he did not take very seriously, for he pressed ahead, crossed the Marne, and approached the Seine. His final withdrawal was compelled by the advance north-eastwardly from Paris of the Sixth French Army, which he had to return to face. The subsequent advance northward of the Allies further east to his rear placed him between the jaws of a vice from which he escaped by an exhibition of tactical skill to which Major Whitton gives full credit. That he escaped at all from so perilous a position must in part be attributed to a certain failure on the part of the Allies to seize fully their opportunity. No statement is given of the strength of the British expeditionary force after its rough handling. The author maintains stoutly that it was unbeaten and he spares it from all criticism, which possibly may be a proper attitude to maintain toward a minor force become the victims of untoward conditions. But it seems apparent that the British following of the German rear-guard, mainly composed of cavalry, was marked by no audacity, and the German cavalry had little difficulty in holding the British back. The slowness of the British advance on the 7th is attributed by the author to General Joffre's failure to anticipate the rapidity of von Kluck's retirement. Nevertheless, with only a rear-guard in front of them, the British advance from the Grand

Morin to the Petit Morin, a distance of not much over seven miles, appears to have been very deliberate. As it was, on the 9th the British were only a dozen miles from von Kluck's rear. The position of the commander of the first German army was the more perilous from the fact that it was not until the 7th that Maubeuge fell, the holding out of which fortress far to the rear had seriously interfered with the German transportation. The failure of the efforts from the vicinity of Verdun and Nancy to roll up the armies of the Allies, coupled with the necessity of von Kluck's retirement, made compulsory the falling back of the whole German line, for which orders appear to have been given on the 9th of September.

Excellent in detail, except for a few adjectives applied to the foe, which could well have been omitted from so useful a military study, and for a few war tales told by subalterns, which hardly merit a place in such a book, the author's narrative is not quite so satisfactory or convincing in its suggestion of the broader play of the Allied strategy.

What the treaties and understandings between the Allies were, is of minor consequence as compared with the common action. It is plain that in the working out of the common purpose, and contrary to a prevalent opinion which gives most of the credit of the Allied defense to France, the French, with some minor help from the Belgians and the British, were to hold the Germans while the Russians overwhelmed Germany and Austria-Hungary from the East. The Russians under the old régime made the most earnest endeavors to enact the part which inevitably fell to them, and it was the most difficult part to carry out. They made the only great offensives into the enemy's country. Driven out they came back. Of all the Allies they did the hardest fighting up to the close of 1915, when there had been 1,200,000 Russians killed to 800,000 Frenchmen and 200,000 British. Nothing could be plainer than that, in the early years of the war, Russia saved the day for France, England, and all the Allies. Her share of the material things to be gained in this war, which is so largely economic in its motives, early disappeared with the disaster to the Allies before the Dardanelles. Nevertheless Russia did not quit until she was defeated, as the Southern Confederacy was defeated in 1865, and defeated for much the same reason, not because her supply of men was exhausted, but because her lower form of the present-day industrial civilization had broken down, just as the lower form of civilization broke down in America in our Civil War. It showed small comprehension in Americans of what Russia had actually done, when the Revolution overturned the government that served the Allies so well and the downfall was hailed with a kind of hysterical glee.

Major Whitton recognizes the important fact that in 1914 Germany had to take troops from the West to meet the Russian invasion, but the thoroughly equipped historian in the future will be forced by the facts to portray Russia's important war-work on broader lines than he has

done, even while it is recognized that there was doubtless in Russia a considerable party, which owing to the proximity of Germany and the many alliances between the two countries, social and economic, and their mutual dependence upon each other for the necessities and conveniences of life did not favor the position in which Russia found herself.

ISAAC R. PENNYPACKER.

*Der Weltkrieg: Vorläufige Orientierung von einem Schweizerischen Standpunkt aus.* Von S. ZURLINDEN. Erster Band. (Zürich: Orell Füssli. 1917. Pp. xxiv, 532. 12 fr.)

A PRELIMINARY orientation regarding the World War would seem to be a useful project, and the Swiss standpoint would commend itself as an excellent position from which to undertake it. The author of this book is deeply conscious of the "difficulties" which such a venture must encounter, and modestly suggests that he would prefer to call his book an "attempt" at such an orientation. It is, however, no slender sketch in the nature of a general introduction that he has in mind, but a work in three or four large and closely printed volumes, of which this is the first, intended to contain an exposition of the historical ground-principles of the war, of the immediate causes of its occurrence, of its effects and attendant phenomena in the participating and neutral states, especially in Switzerland, and finally the particular course of the war in brief outline.

The present volume is entirely devoted to a statement and criticism of fundamental ideas and principles, comprising chapters on Human Nature, the Superstition of War, the Principle of Authority, Secret Diplomacy, Militarism, Imperialism, and the Theology of War.

The author's point of view is, as the subtitle informs us, that of a Swiss citizen, and is therefore democratic. Notwithstanding the racial affinity and cultural community of the German-Swiss people with the subjects of the Central Empires, his reflections, although emanating from a neutral, are frankly admitted to be adversely critical of militarism and imperialism. "When the Germans", he says, "explain that they cannot permit their militarism to be taken from them", the Swiss must reply, "On that very account we cannot surrender our opposition to militarism". It is against a system, however, and by no means against the interests of the German people, that the writer is contending.

If war were a necessity inherent in the nature of man, he concedes, it would be futile to endeavor to escape its evils. His first chapter is therefore devoted to an exposure of the fallacy that sanguinary conflict is an essential outgrowth of human nature. It is, he grants, an outgrowth of a purely animal nature, and is in consequence a form of human expression in so far as man is merely an animal. But he is more than an animal, and, in proportion as he is distinctively human, sanguinary combat ceases to be a form of his voluntary activity. Struggle

is, indeed, essential to progress, and even to existence; but struggle, the author holds, does not of necessity imply the need or the advantage of mutual destruction of human beings. On the contrary, human development has not resulted from natural selection, in the sense of the survival of the physically strongest, but from the social capacity of man and the advantage of mutual helpfulness. Even as an animal, man has acquired his supremacy by his power to perceive what is harmful, by his will to overcome it even in himself, and by his foresight in preventing it. The theory that room for expansion and pressure for food-supply are necessary and therefore justifiable causes of war is dismissed as a stupid failure to perceive that it is not increased territorial control that is the true correlate of growing population, for it is the technique of commerce that is the effective regulator of the food-supply. Neither race, nor nationality, nor any biological condition whatever presents a necessarily determining cause of war. War is a will. If war were really believed to be "necessary", in any physically compulsory sense, an imperative part of "the divine order of the world", as its theoretical advocates pretend, why should anyone ever think of entertaining scruples about beginning it, or try to defend himself against the accusation of being responsible for it? "Why will no one have it on his conscience? How does it happen that Kaiser Wilhelm, rising from the signature of the declaration of war, says with trembling lips: 'I have not willed this war'?" Why, upon the theory of necessity and divine purpose, should the human will ever be even spoken of in connection with war? And since war implies two sides, and both are necessary to make it a war, why should right or wrong be supposed in any way to enter into the problem? And yet it is the whole of the problem, and everyone in every concrete case admits that it is.

It would be interesting to examine the remaining chapters of this book, especially the one on the Principle of Authority, but this is impossible in the limits of space assigned to this review. It may be said, in general, that this volume is too bulky and the number of volumes in the series is too great to insure many readers, that the whole argument might be stated more effectively in briefer compass, that the citations are too long and too numerous, and that the wealth of information which the book contains is difficult to extract from the crowded pages in which many valuable ideas are obscured. The table of contents is full and the notes are abundant. If the same pains had been taken in preparing an index, which a book of such bulk and so many small details imperatively needs, it would have rendered it trebly more useful to the reader. Few persons in this busy world will ever read this book through, but many would frequently refer to it, and would find profit in doing so, if its treasures were not buried so deep beneath the surface.

DAVID JAYNE HILL.



*Germany's Commercial Grip on the World: her Business Methods Explained.* By HENRI HAUSER, Professor of Dijon University. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1917. Pp. xv, 259. \$1.65.)

PROFESSOR HAUSER'S discussion adds little that is new to the facts bearing on this now very familiar subject. His book was first published in November, 1915, and the present third edition bears date of April, 1916. The preface to this later edition points out that the book was originally written with "no other pretension than to mark a date, to describe a state of affairs existent at a determined moment", and that he had decided "to reprint it again with few alterations".

Under such circumstances, both the facts and the conclusions necessarily lack much of the perspective in which the subject has had to be considered since the United States declared war on Germany, and the South American states, in whose markets Germany had achieved so great commercial successes, either followed our example by declaring war, or else broke off diplomatic relations. Professor Hauser bases much of his discussion on the assertion, which he emphasizes by printing it in heavy type, that

Germany sows during the tempest; victor or vanquished, she will reap the harvest. While her rivals keep silent, refuse to book orders, postpone all talk of business till the morrow of peace, Germany proclaims to all the world that she exists, that her firms are ever powerful, that they will be ready on the first day of peace to answer the call made on them.

This correctly enough described the position of things in the middle of 1915, after only one year of war and before Germany's full development of her submarine war on neutral ships and cargoes. But it may well be doubted if it describes the situation or probabilities as they exist today. Count Luxburg's exploits alone would offset all such continued commercial propaganda as Germany might have undertaken in South America since the beginning of the war. Professor Hauser's assertion that Germany's commercial rivals "keep silent" and "refuse to book orders" in the foreign field had a plausible sound in 1915, when not only had England's exports to such neutral markets been cut in two as compared with 1913, but when even the export trade of the United States with South America and Asia, for the twelve months ending with June of 1915, was smaller by \$47,000,000 than its best pre-war figures. England's sales of merchandise to the neutrals have not appreciably increased since Professor Hauser's book was written; but in the fiscal year 1917 our own country's exports to them had increased no less than \$426,000,000 over the 1915 figure. It may be open to argument whether this huge increase is not temporary; but it certainly does not show inertia among Germany's rivals in capturing her lost foreign trade. Political and economic conditions have alike brought about a different situation from that of two years ago.



Professor Hauser's review of the methods and policies by which Germany achieved her remarkable successes in the field of foreign trade between 1871 and 1914 is comprehensive, though it gives no fresh information to those who have read the numerous discussions published on the subject since the war began. The intensive organization of her home industries, the government subsidies, the patient adaptation of goods to the particular tastes and prejudices of foreign markets, the scientific control by Germany of the "dumping" policy through her "cartels" or trade combinations—all this is duly and clearly explained. So with the less honorable aspects of her foreign trade campaign: the policy of commercial espionage, the propaganda for misrepresenting trade adversaries, the more or less fraudulent imitation of staple goods of those adversaries.

The reader naturally looks for the author's conclusions regarding the future; his views as to what Germany will be able to do in foreign trade after the war, and as to what Germany's present antagonists ought to do. In this direction, the book falls short of the natural expectations. Advice and warning regarding the Allies' policy in their future competition with Germany are in the main directed to France, which must adopt better plans for combination of enterprise, must discard "the red-tape bureaucracy which in France stifles all initiative", and must promote industrial facilities intelligently through the state. But the author gives us no clear view of future conditions as they will apply to England, for instance, or Japan, or the United States, in challenging Germany's commercial grip on the world. He does not advocate the "economic war" after peace. "To boycott Germany is a dream, a nightmare." Nevertheless, as concerns the policy of the Allies, Professor Hauser "can see only one means of acting with efficacy, and that is not to act alone":

It is to be wished that the Entente, after having triumphed on the field of battle, shall find itself still united to-morrow in the domain of economics—an Entente enlarged by the accession of those nations who will wish to accept the conditions of a new Pact of London. If the most-favoured-nation clause must reappear in future commercial treaties, it is important that the effect of it shall be limited only to the signatories of this declaration—that is to say, to those nations which will submit to it in good faith, in all reciprocity. It is also by means of this Entente that we shall be able to fight against dumping.

Perhaps the plainest conclusion which the reader will draw from the numerous contemporary discussions of Germany and the post-bellum foreign market is that we are discussing developments of a future in which the actual controlling causes cannot be foreseen. It is a striking fact that while non-German economists like Professor Hauser are implicitly taking for granted Germany's immediate and successful resumption of her achievements in foreign trade, as soon as her ships are able to sail the ocean again, the high experts in Germany herself are talking

very differently. It was Ballin of the Hamburg Line who publicly predicted, a year ago, that there would virtually be no future for the German shipping industry in the period immediately following the war, because exhaustion of her supplies of raw material would prevent exports, and because a depreciated foreign exchange (which would continue) would make imports so costly as to restrict the power of purchasing them. German newspapers of the more serious sort have been discussing openly what would be Germany's road to a new prosperity, assuming that she could not regain her foreign trade. There will be much to learn, on both sides of the argument, from the real events of those new conditions of national life and national intercourse which will come with the great political and economic readjustment.

ALEXANDER D. NOYES.

*The Rebuilding of Europe: a Survey of Forces and Conditions.* By DAVID JAYNE HILL. (New York: Century Company. 1917. Pp. x, 289. \$1.50.)

THIS is a collection of eight papers, six of which were delivered as lectures at the Johns Hopkins University on the Schouler Foundation in March, 1917, and five of which were subsequently published in the *Century Magazine*. In the main they are devoted to a consideration of what the author regards as the fundamental cause of war, and of the means by which, in his opinion, wars in the future may be avoided. According to Dr. Hill the cause of the present international anarchy is to be found in the traditional conception of sovereignty, which attributes to every independent state a legal right to make war upon another state for such reason as it deems sufficient. From this flows the equally well recognized right of conquest—the right to appropriate territory belonging to the enemy and, with it, dominion and sovereignty over the people who inhabit it, without any regard whatever to their own wishes. This conception of sovereignty, developed during the sixteenth century and recognized and confirmed by the peace of Westphalia, is one of the postulates of European public law and its rightfulness has never been repudiated or questioned by any of the great international congresses or conferences. This in Mr. Hill's opinion is a "monstrous doctrine", a "baneful fiction", a "wicked and infamous dogma", such as would never have been invented by any jurist or statesman "under the constitutional régime". Its effect is to accord to every independent state a place above the law and morality and to make it a sort of "licensed brigand". Instead of the states of the world constituting collectively a "family" of nations in any real sense of the word, therefore, they occupy in respect to one another the position of the "poor, nasty, brutish" individual in Hobbes's state of nature—perpetually in a state of potential if not of actual warfare with one another.

This dogma that a state because of the right of absolute sovereignty attributed to it may lawfully make war upon a neighbor for reasons the

justice of which the rest of the world may utterly condemn, and which requires other nations to assume the attitude of indifferent spectators even when the war constitutes an unjustifiable aggression in violation of international law, Mr. Hill very justly characterizes as unsocial and anarchistic. We must, he says, have a "real society of states", a "commonwealth of nations", instead of a multitude of absolutely independent sovereignties, each of which is subject to no law or rule of morality except such as it may choose to recognize as binding. He does not, however, go to the length of advocating the abolition of existing states and their absorption into a universal empire, as Dante proposed, nor does he suggest the erection over them of a superstate; he is content with a scheme of international co-operation, along the line of the proposed league to enforce peace. "The only way", he says, "in which there is ever to be a real society of states is for those great powers which can find a sufficient community of interest to unite in the determination that they will themselves observe principles of justice and equity and that *they will unite their forces in defense of them*" (p. 107).

It is impossible within the space of this review to examine into the merits of Mr. Hill's diagnosis and the remedy which he proposes. It is difficult for the reviewer to avoid the feeling that at times he exaggerates what he calls the "evil heritage" of absolute sovereignty, by attributing to states a freedom of action which international law no longer concedes as belonging to them. But whatever may be one's opinion as to his interpretation of the theory of state omnipotence, there ought to be no dissent from his proposition that the right of conquest should be abolished, that the attitude of silence, if not of indifference, heretofore adopted by states in regard to violations of international law should be abandoned, and that some form of international co-operation must be organized for compelling states to observe their international obligations and duties and to respect the law which has received the common assent of mankind. His treatment of the subject is characterized by originality, sound thinking, and breadth of view, and his book is a very meritorious contribution to the growing output of literature dealing with the reconstruction of international law.

JAMES WILFORD GARNER.

#### BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*The Voyages of the Norsemen to America.* By WILLIAM HOVGAARD, Professor of Naval Design and Construction, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. [Scandinavian Monographs, vol. I.] (New York: The American-Scandinavian Foundation. 1914. Pp. xxi, 304. \$4.00.)

IN this work Professor Hovgaard has undertaken to elucidate and fortify the view that the Vinland sagas are, on the whole, reliable records of actual geographic exploration. But, as against the opinion of

Dr. Gustav Storm and Dr. Finnur Jonsson that the Saga of Erik the Red is a more reliable record than the so-called Greenland narrative, and against Dr. Nansen's dictum that both sagas are devoid of historical value, Professor Hovgaard takes the position that "both accounts . . . may probably be considered as essentially historic and essentially of equal value". He makes no unqualified concession to any of Nansen's clever contentions, and shows scant regard for the most emphatic declarations of Storm and Jonsson with regard to texts.

If Professor Hovgaard had limited himself to supporting his statement that "In general, the simple and straightforward narrative in the sagas . . . will by itself be sufficient to convince people of its essential truthfulness", he would have assigned himself a task for which he has special qualifications, particularly the matter of presenting "the peculiar conditions under which the navigation of the Norsemen took place". The author's experience as an officer in the Royal Danish navy, and as professor of naval design and construction in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, makes him eminently fitted to treat the nautical and maritime phases of the Vinland problem, and he has performed the task well. In a series of chapters he discusses the art of ship-building among the Norsemen of the period, gives an excellent résumé of the early history of the Norsemen in Iceland, followed by an interesting account of the Norse settlements in Greenland, whence the Vinland voyagers issued forth, and gives also an adequate summary of the geography as well as of the hydrographic and climatic conditions of the North-Atlantic coast of America, accompanied by a description of the Eskimos and Indians of this region, in which he argues that the Norse explorers doubtless came in contact with both of these races—all illuminated with such a wealth of well-selected photographic illustrations as have never before been bestowed on this subject. The various phases of life in the Norse colonies of Iceland and Greenland, especially the economic conditions, are set forth in such a way as to prepare the reader for a ready acceptance of the main facts of the saga narratives, and make it plain that it would have been very strange if the Norsemen during their centuries of abode on the inhospitable shores of southwestern Greenland had not found land to the southwest and made serious efforts at colonization.

But the author does not apply the mass of information that he has gathered in direct refutation of Nansen's astute and vigorous onslaught on the Vinland sagas, which, at present, is the vital issue in the discussion. He is merely preparing the ground for a detailed examination of the contents of both sagas for the purpose of a "reconstruction of the voyages" (the title of the last chapter) and the identification of the regions visited. Upon this last point the author's efforts are centred. But there need be no hesitancy in declaring that, like so many previous investigators of this knotty problem, he will surely fail to convince critical students of any definite results. For it is glaringly evident that to

trace, along an irregular coast of great extent, the course of ancient mariners who had no nautical instruments, is a hopeless task. So far as the historical importance of these isolated and fruitless attempts at exploration and colonization is concerned, it is sufficient to demonstrate that Leif Erikson and Thorfinn Karlsefni were real men who belonged to the well-known Norse colony of Greenland; that in the early part of the eleventh century they visited various parts of the North American continent—got far enough south to make the observation that day and night were of more equal length than in Greenland; and, finally, found savages whose hostility prevented permanent settlement in the new regions. Just where the Norse explorers landed may have some sentimental interest, but it is not important, nor is it essential for the purpose of establishing the general truthfulness of the Vinland sagas.

In spite of the superfluity of detailed discourse relating to the identification of localities, Professor Hovgaard's book contains much valuable information. Letter-press, maps, and illustrations are in all respects excellent, and are a credit to the American-Scandinavian Foundation.

JULIUS E. OLSON.

*Americ Vespuce, 1451-1512: sa Bibliographie, sa Vie, ses Voyages, ses Découvertes, l'Attribution de son Nom à l'Amérique, ses Relations Authentiques et Contestées.* Par HENRY VIGNAUD. [Recueil de Voyages et de Documents pour servir à l'Histoire de la Géographie, XXIII.] (Paris: Ernest Leroux. 1917. Pp. ix, 421. 40 fr.)

THE foregoing title shows sufficiently the wide scope of the present volume. The book is the fruit of years of labor on the part of one who has devoted the greater part of a long lifetime to the history of American discovery. Its author has undertaken the huge work successively abandoned by Harrisse and Uzielli. If he brings to his task less of a critical spirit than either of these scholars would have done, that fault is almost pardonable in view of his enthusiasm for his subject and the noble desire to do justice to a man much maligned. For Vignaud frankly ranges himself as a Vespucci apologist. He reacts strongly against all recent doubting Thomases and reverts to the position taken by Varnhagen and John Fiske. Typographically the book is both beautiful and accurate; it is printed in quarto format with wide margins suggestive of anything but war-time penury.

The bibliographical portion contains little not to be found in Justin Winsor and Fumagalli, with the exception of recent publications, and not all of these are included. No mention is made of Rambaldi's biography, certain works of Antonio de Martino, the brief but important survey of Vespucci by the late Professor Bourne in his *Spain in America*, nor of the older writings of Gino Capponi. Doubtless a systematic

search would disclose further omissions. But most amazing is the failure to mention such important historical sources as the Magliabechiana manuscript of the *Soderini Letter* and the Amoretti Codex. The biography of Vespucci contains nothing new. Nowhere in the book has a new source been utilized. The texts published are reprints without attempt at collation or correction. Nevertheless it is convenient to have all this material assembled between two covers. We have: the *Mundus Novus* reprinted from the original with variants from the edition of Jehan Lambert Paris, with omission of the facsimiles; the *Soderini Letter*, taken from Varnhagen's faulty text, with some of the latter's typographical deviations, and without the cuts; the translation of the same into French by Norbert Sumien; the Latin text from the *Cosmographiae Introductio*, 1507; the three so-called apocryphal letters, which Vignaud does not accept as genuine. Vespucci's Latin and Spanish letters are not included.

Vignaud upholds the authenticity of the disputed first voyage. Not only that, but he holds with Varnhagen and Fiske that Vespucci sailed around the Gulf of Mexico and north beyond the coasts of Florida and Georgia. Once more the old "Parias-Lariab" controversy which we had supposed laid to rest is revived. In an introductory note Vignaud states that my study of the *Soderini Letter* had reached him too late to use, but adds that he is unconvinced that the Magliabechiana manuscript has any value. This is the only logical position which those who believe that Vespucci took the course described will henceforth be able to assume. For once let them admit the value of this source and their whole argument falls to the ground. The matter hinges on a point of textual criticism. Three versions, the Latin, the Magliabechiana, and the Amoretti Codex read *Parias*, *Perias*. The two first named at least, it can be demonstrated, often preserve the correct tradition (and certainly did in this instance) as against the Florentine print, which alone reads *Lariab*. The name *Lariab* never appeared on any map. It has never been identified with any town. It is a myth. For no better reason than that certain Mexican Indian names end in -ab, Varnhagen would place *Lariab* near Tampico, in spite of the fact that Vespucci states that he sailed 870 leagues to the northwest of the place in dispute. This argumentation Vignaud now adopts as trustfully as Fiske did before him. The negative evidence of the suit of the heirs of Columbus against the Spanish crown, invoked so tellingly by many critics, Vignaud brushes aside as irrelevant on the ground that Vespucci made no claim to have discovered *Parias*. The time is past for rejecting the Magliabechiana manuscript with a dogmatic assertion that it had no value. Where but from this source did Bandini and Varnhagen learn that Piero Soderini was the recipient of the letter? Not from the print, which Vignaud alone accepts as authoritative. Varnhagen used this source when it suited his purpose and suppressed its readings when these did not support his theories. Modern scholars should no longer be deceived.



Uzielli, whose work Vignaud had taken up, never tired of emphasizing the importance of this version. If we are ever to make progress in solving problems connected with Vespucci it will be through the critical study of sources, not by rethrashing old straw.

Throughout the book Vignaud displays a strong bias in favor of Vespucci's apologists and against those who have even mildly disputed some of his assertions. The most valuable portion of the study is that which traces the steps by which the name America came to be fastened upon the western continents. The subject has never been treated more fully than here. The views advanced are not new but sound, except for the attempt to show that Vespucci actually was the first to discover and chart a large portion of the North American continent.

GEORGE TYLER NORTHUP.

*Colonial Virginia: its People and Customs.* By MARY NEWTON STANARD. (Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1917. Pp. xv, 376. \$6.00.)

THIS work, important in content and spirited in style, was written by the wife of the secretary of the Virginia Historical Society, and is worthy of the excellent paper, print, binding, and illustrations which are its adornments. Mrs. Stanard has had access to her husband's copious notes, yet the work is her own. Its facts are drawn largely from unpublished manuscripts of various kinds, but also from documents printed in historical magazines, from the colonial newspaper, the *Virginia Gazette*, Fithian's *Diary*, etc. The book deals not merely with the people of colonial Virginia and their customs, but also with their houses, furniture, crockery, silver-ware, watches, clocks, jewelry, clothes, books, pictures, etc.

The first chapter tells of the founders of the colony down to 1625 and of the subsequent settlers. Almost all of the early Virginia colonists—of all classes, from noblemen to indentured servants—perished of disease, hunger, cold, or massacre by Indians; and those were stout-hearted indeed who remained to risk suffering and death. As to the origin of the "higher planting class", Mrs. Stanard considers that the families which can be traced to the English gentry are somewhat more numerous than those of mercantile origin; differing, thus, from Dr. Thomas J. Wertenbaker, who maintains, in his *Patrician and Plebeian in Virginia*, that a considerable majority of upper-class Virginians are descended from English merchants. She does not say much of the Huguenot, Scotch-Irish, and German colonists, or of the negroes.

In the chapter on Education the author wonders what that "embittered old man", Governor Berkeley, meant by thanking God in 1671 that there were no free schools in Virginia, since he must have been "well aware" of the existence of certain schools, of which she gives account, and of others as well. The chapter is subdivided into Free Schools,



Private Schools, Tutors, William and Mary College, and Studying Abroad.

The chapter on Social Life is one of the most interesting. In it is quoted a letter from Col. Daniel Parke, about 1702, to his daughter Frances, afterward Mrs. Custis. Among other things he says: "Do not learn to romp but behave yourself soberly and like a gentlewoman. . . . Be calm and Obliging to all the Servants, and when you speak doe it mildly, even to the poorest slave", etc. In the same chapter is this extract from the diary of a "very lively little colonial girl", Sally Fairfax: "On thursday the 26th of decem. Mama made 6 Mince pies and 7 custards, 12 tarts, 1 chicking pye and 4 pudings for the ball".

It may surprise many to read what the commissioners to settle the boundary between Virginia and North Carolina in 1710 report of the hospitable Mrs. Frances Jones: "She is a very civil woman and shews nothing of ruggedness, or Immodesty in her carriage, yett she will carry a gunn in the woods and kill deer, turkeys, etc., shoot down wild cattle, catch and tye hoggs, knock down beeves with an ax and perform the most manfull Exercises as well as most men in those parts."

In these days of enforced aridity it is refreshing to read this item from the diary of the Father of his Country in 1771: "Dined at the Speaker's and went to the Play—after wch Drank a Bowl or two of Punch at Mrs. Campbell's".

There is a chapter on Virginia and England, and chapters on the Theatre, Outdoor Sports, Music, Religion, and Funeral Customs. But perhaps no chapter will elicit more good laughs from the reader than that on Courtship and Marriage.

R. H. DABNEY.

*The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909.* Compiled from Original Sources and illustrated by Photo-intaglio Reproductions of important Maps, Plans, Views, and Documents in Public and Private Collections, by I. N. PHELPS STOKES. Volumes I. and II. (New York: Robert H. Dodd. 1915-1916. Pp. lii, 473; xxxii, 452. \$40.00 each.)

It has been the aim of Mr. Stokes in this work to collect as far as possible, in chronological form, all maps, charts, plans, and views of topographical or artistic importance which are known to exist, affecting the city of New York from its earliest days. These have been arranged in two main groups, the first embracing those from the earliest settlement down to the year 1807; the second group is designed to contain a selection from the multifarious cartographic and pictorial productions from 1807 to the present time.

Of the material collected in this work nearly all is well-known, and is readily accessible to the student in much larger scale than Mr. Stokes has been able to give to most of his reproductions in the small quarto

pages of the volumes under review. In the prosecution of his enterprise, however, he has been remarkably fortunate in bringing out several items of the greatest cartographic importance, the very existence of which was hitherto unsuspected; and because of his success in this respect the work will always remain a monument in its particular field. The story of the discoveries is a remarkable one, and a brief outline of them seems not out of place in a review of Mr. Stokes's work.

Rather more than a quarter of a century ago it became generally known that the eminent historical critic in Paris, M. Henri HARRISSE, had come into possession of a topographical chart of Manhattan Island, of unusual interest. As it was apparently guarded with considerable jealousy by M. HARRISSE, little was known of his treasure, except that it was understood to represent about the date 1640, and was commonly spoken of as the "Jan Vingboons" chart, from the name of the supposed cartographer.

In 1911, under the will of M. HARRISSE, this so-called "Manatus" or "Vingboons" chart passed by bequest to the Library of Congress at Washington, and became the subject of critical examination. It then appeared to be a somewhat roughly executed but generally faithful survey of Manhattan Island and the adjacent shores, whereon were depicted in the crude pictorial fashion common to seventeenth-century charts the leading *bouwerijen* of the Dutch settlers. A pretty full but somewhat carelessly compiled key fixed the date of this chart to the year 1639, but there was nothing upon it to indicate the supposed authorship of Jan Vingboons. Under the bequest of M. HARRISSE there also passed to the Library of Congress two other charts which, from their apparent periods of construction and from the general style of their execution, seemed to be companion pieces to the "Manatus" chart. Of these, one was entitled *Pascaert van Nieuw Nederlandt Virginia ende Nieuw Engelandt verthoonende alles wat van die Landen by See oft by Land is ondeckt oft Bekent*. This shows, in pretty correct form, the American coast from the mouth of Chesapeake Bay to the Penobscot River.

The remaining one of these three pieces (all of which are reproduced in Mr. Stokes's work) is entitled *Noort Rivier in Nieu Nederlandt*, and shows the course of the North or Hudson's River from near Sandy Hook to the "Vastigoyt" or Indian fortification near the Falls of Cohoes.

Investigations soon traced back these three pieces (which seem for a time to have been thought originals), as having once formed part of a large collection of views, maps, and plans of the Dutch settlements in various parts of the world, which, bound in two calf volumes, formed part of the stock of the old firm (established in 1680) of Gerard Hulst van Keulen, publisher of sea-charts at Amsterdam. The collection was sold at auction at Amsterdam, September 7, 1885, to the well-known house of Frederik Muller and Company, who had the volumes broken up and the literary materials dispersed. In this manner the three charts

above mentioned came into the possession of M. Henri Harrisse, while many of the other pieces of the collection found their way into the Royal Archives at the Hague, where they became the subjects of an exhaustive examination and study by Dr. F. C. Wieder, assistant librarian of the University of Amsterdam.

In the meantime, during the year 1910, Col. J. J. Staal, editor of the Dutch geographical journal *Tijdschrift van het Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, in the course of a visit to Italy, observed various Dutch charts and plans, property of the Italian government, which were framed and hung upon the walls of a room in the Villa Castello near Florence. Colonel Staal noted these briefly in his journal, and they were more carefully examined in the following year by Mr. J. W. Yzerman, president of the Royal Dutch Geographical Society. Later, Mr. Yzerman, upon the occasion of an accidental meeting at the Hague with Dr. Wieder, described to the latter the drawings which he had recently seen in Italy, and from his description of them Dr. Wieder at once believed that the pieces in the Castello Villa were of the same collection, and duplicates of those at the Hague. It was also disclosed that there was in the Castello collection "a hitherto unrecorded large colored manuscript plan of New Amsterdam during the Dutch period".

With these facts in view, Dr. Wieder made a trip to Florence to examine the newly discovered material. "It was a great surprise", says Mr. Stokes, "to find in Italy such an extensive collection of Dutch-drawn maps, plans, and views of countries that had no particular connection with Italy". The explanation however soon appeared. During the years 1667-1669, the Tuscan Prince Cosimo de' Medici made a trip through England and Holland, accompanied by Prince Corsini. A manuscript account of this trip is preserved in the Biblioteca Laurenziana in Florence, and it appears quite conclusively that the material was then acquired.

The copies of Dutch charts and plans in the Villa Castello, from similarity in technique, were apparently all from one source, and Dr. Wieder's theory was confirmed by the discovery among them of a duplicate of the "Manatus" plan of M. Harrisse, having a much more accurate key than the latter, but being itself corrected in several important details by the Harrisse chart. It was readily seen therefore that both these plans were copied from an unknown original. The designation of Jan Vingboons as author was apparently a mere assumption by Messrs. Muller and Company, in their sales catalogue, from that name as it appeared on one of the West India maps in the collection.

The main discovery at the Villa Castello however was that of the plan of New Amsterdam, which had remained, incredible as it may seem, utterly unknown to all the eager collectors of the last century. It is a neatly drawn plan, 25 inches by 18½ in size, entitled *Afbeeldinge van de Stadt Amsterdam in Nieuw Nederlandt*. It represents very nearly the

year 1660, and is believed by Mr. Stokes (probably justly) to be the work of the Long Island surveyor, Jacques Cortelyou. In its technique it shows the semi-perspective style of Braun's monumental work, the *Civitates* of the preceding century, but its marked accuracy of detail in showing the division lines of property adds greatly to its practical value. Mr. Stokes has inserted an enlarged "Re-draft of the Castello Plan" as a frontispiece to his second volume. In this the small town appears in a glorified state, the imagination of the artist having been allowed full play to besprinkle the houses, not only with windows and doors from conventional models, but with gables, tile roofings, dormer windows, etc., to add shrubbery and other attractions, and even to decorate the old Dutch burial ground on lower Broadway with sad memorials of the dead which probably never appeared there, the original being marked only by a few arbitrary signs. It is this original, however, in its somewhat severe simplicity which must always be resorted to by students of the early topography of New Amsterdam.

Mr. Stokes has further enriched his collection by another piece which it would be unjust to pass by without special mention. It is a sepia wash drawing which came into the possession of Mr. Stokes from Baron Van Sypestein, "a well known amateur and collector from the Hague". It throws much light upon the somewhat mysterious view of the same description (hitherto regarded as unique), in the possession of the New York Historical Society, and which bears the enigmatical inscription: "In 't Schip Lydia door Lourens Heermans Block A°1650." Neither Lourens Heermans Block nor the ship *Lydia* was known in the records of New Amsterdam, yet he was generally spoken of as the author of the view; and the date upon it, though unsatisfactory, was assumed to mark its period. Mr. Stokes's view has practically the same features as that of the Historical Society, with one very important difference. While both of these views show the church built in 1642 in Fort Amsterdam, the Historical Society's view shows also near the East River shore the large "Stads Herberg" or city tavern, finished about the end of the year 1643. Mr. Stokes's view shows no signs of the Herberg and as the location is so conspicuous as to forbid the supposition that the building was accidentally omitted, the conclusion is irresistible that Mr. Stokes's copy is a first state, and the other view a later one, from an unknown original of the year 1642 or 1643, and is therefore established as the second authentic view of New Amsterdam, the first being the so-called Hartgers View of 1628. The "Block" inscription probably merely records a presentation to the Dutch vessel in 1650.

The second volume of Mr. Stokes's work contains an extensive collection, taken from what he aptly characterizes as "the cartographical chaos of the sixteenth Century", of the sea-charts constructed by the explorers of various nations, showing the North American coasts. It is accompanied by an interesting and learned disquisition from the pen of Dr. F. C. Wieder; but by reason of the reduced size of the charts, and

the complicated system of grouping the same, together with the additional disadvantage of a remotely placed text, these costly volumes would seem not likely to be of the greatest practical advantage to students. Some of the historical deductions, such for example as those relating to the discoveries of Verazzano, the lost island of "Luisa", the supposed voyage of Thomas Dermer through Long Island Sound in 1619 (based entirely upon a misapprehension of his allusion to what was assumed to be Hell Gate in the East River), are not likely to be accepted unquestioningly by historical critics.

Mr. Stokes's work contains a voluminous body of text and comments. In his preface he acknowledges the assistance of various persons in the preparation of these, but without specifically stating the portions attributable to individuals. It is evident that their conclusions may vary materially in critical value, and may require considerable further examination and research before they can be considered as established historical facts, and not merely personal opinions.

An example of this is the somewhat ludicrous assertion that the prominent structure with a conical-shaped roof shown upon all the various forms of Mr. Stokes's "Prototype View" of New Amsterdam, and believed by most recent writers from its topographical situation to be the old Bark Mill, in the loft of which the first church services were held—is a hay barrack in the distance. The explanation of this curious notion appears from the newly discovered "Castello plan", where in the general line of perspective of these views, but at a distance of nearly half a mile behind the houses of the town, there appears a small object probably designed to show a Dutch hay barrack on the old Damen farm, about at the present Broadway and Cedar Street. That this small structure, adapted to the needs of a farm of no more than thirty acres or so, was visible at all from the point of view is sufficiently doubtful; but that its location was utterly inconsistent with the topographical features of the views, and that upon the beautiful "Prototype View" from the Hague, doors and windows are plainly enough depicted upon the building, are considerations which might well have caused some hesitation in enunciating such a singular conclusion as that in the text of the work.

J. H. INNES.

*Kiliaen van Rensselaer van 1623 tot 1636.* Door Dr. J. SPINOZA CATELLA JESSURUN. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1917. Pp. 213, xxv. 5 gld.)

THIS work, which was originally submitted as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Dutch Literature in Amsterdam University, is but one of many indications that have come to us within recent years of a revival of interest in Holland in the subject of former Dutch colonization in New Netherland.

The main object of the work is to present a contribution to the history of this colonization in the form of a minute and systematic account of certain phases of the settlement of the colony of Rensselaerswyck which in the author's opinion have heretofore not been treated with the fullness they deserve in Mr. Nicholaas de Roever's well-known articles on "Kiliaen van Rensselaer and his colony of Rensselaerswyck", which appeared in 1890 in *Oud Holland*. This object is accomplished in a series of chapters on such topics as colonization, agriculture, cattle, administration, and van Rensselaer's relation to the Dutch West India Company, which together give a detailed account of the steps that were taken by the patroon in building up his colony. Preceding this account there is a chapter entitled Kiliaen van Rensselaer's Preparation, in which the author briefly traces van Rensselaer's efforts in behalf of colonization during the period of his administration as a director of the Dutch West India Company, while at the end appears a sketch of van Rensselaer's character. The entire work is based primarily on the manuscript material that was first used by Mr. de Roever and that has since been published in English translation, together with a translation of Mr. de Roever's articles, under the title of *Van Rensselaer Bowier Manuscripts*. Fortunately however the author has not confined himself to this well-known source of information, but also consulted other sources, more particularly some hitherto neglected records of the Dutch West India Company that are preserved among the general archives of the realm at the Hague. From these records, which include an important volume of minutes of the Amsterdam Chamber, 1635-1636, as well as the minutes of the Nineteen, 1623-1624, and various volumes of minutes and contracts, etc., of the Zeeland Chamber which are cited by Professor Burr in the *Report of the Venezuela Boundary Commission*, the author has extracted a number of facts that throw new light on minor questions connected with the settlement of the colony. Undoubtedly the most important item is the so-called *Articulbrief*, of March 28, 1624, which sets forth the conditions on which colonists were to settle in New Netherland. Another extract, of less importance, but worth mentioning because it has been chosen as the stopping-point of Dr. Jessurun's narrative, is a resolution of October 28, 1636, instructing the committee on New Netherland to find a suitable person for director-general in the stead of Wouter van Twiller. Still another item, taken from another source, but like the preceding extracts printed in full in the appendix, is the Dutch text of the letter from Isaac de Rasière to Samuel Blommaert, which is given as written from New Netherland in 1626, although internal evidence shows that it was written from memory after de Rasière's return to Holland, not earlier than 1628. Aside from this date, few errors are noted in the book, but issue might be taken with the author on a number of points that cannot be dealt with in this brief review.

In so far as the work can be considered to be a biographical account of Kiliaen van Rensselaer, it is to be regretted that Dr. Jessurun has



not seen fit to extend the scope of his book so as to include a comprehensive account of van Rensselaer's earlier career, both as a merchant and as a director of the West India Company. Although the city archives of Amsterdam are said to have yielded little that was to the author's purpose, it is reasonable to assume that among the notarial papers at Amsterdam and Leyden there are still hidden many business contracts and legal documents that would throw additional light on van Rensselaer's activities. As a further source of information, one might suggest the records of the Consistory at Amsterdam, in which van Rensselaer's name appears as that of an elder, and which might therefore shed an interesting side-light on his religious life. Apart from these limitations, Dr. Jessurun's book is a work of considerable merit, which forms a welcome addition to the literature of New Netherland.

v. L.

*History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal.* By THOMAS HUGHES, of the same society. Text, volume II. From 1645 till 1773. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1917. Pp. xxv, 734. \$8.00.)

PREVIOUS volumes of this work were reviewed in this journal (XIII. 597, XVI. 143). This volume shows the same characteristics which we had found in the preceding parts of the work: great industry, wide reading, zeal for the order whose history it discloses, a discursive and repetitious manner of narrating events, great acrimony against all who differ from the Jesuits, whether the opponents be fellow-members of the Roman Catholic Church, or whether they be Protestants. The book is often more of a polemic than a history and a polemic of sixteenth-century character, abounding in "all manner of uncharitableness". The divagations make the book too long and are often irrelevant: for example, a statement that the Jesuits at St. Inigoes were driven out of their home (p. 58) leads to a page note upon the treatment of the Cross by the Puritans of New England and by Edward Gibbon.

The account of the famous Maryland Toleration Act of 1649 seems to have been written without reading Davis's *Day Star* and a startling position is taken toward that act. The writer believes that the Catholic population had "dwindled into a minority" (p. 4)—though it is doubtful whether it ever was a majority—and that the act was intended as a "medicament for a moribund social polity" (p. 38) and was the "expiring gasp of a toleration practised from the first by the Catholic gentry of Maryland. As to Baltimore, no one knows whether he had anything to do with it" (p. 674). The "Catholic gentry" certainly practised toleration because of Lord Baltimore's instructions.

Sometimes absolutely unwarranted assumptions are made. For example: a paper in the British records gives the boundaries of Maryland according to the charter, together with a date in 1656. It seems almost



incredible that it should be thrice stated in this book, on that slight evidence, that Cecil, Lord Baltimore, "accepted a new charter under the Commonwealth" (p. 56); "condescended to take a patent from the Commonwealth" (p. 671); "took his property back from the Commonwealth by a new patent" and afterwards acted "as if the place were still under the king's charter of 1633"! (pp. 639, 640).

The worst feature of the volume is the attack upon Protestant missions to the Indians. No student now denies the heroic work of the Roman Catholic missionaries, nor that they accomplished more than the Protestants among the Indians; but when a writer goes out of his way to make an attack upon Protestant missions in a separate chapter of his book, he should evince an elementary acquaintance with his subject. What shall we say of a writer who calls a letter written by Jonathan Edwards from Stockbridge, where he was preaching to the Indians, "arm chair philosophy" (p. 299); who appears to have heard of David Brainerd only as a "Scotch missionary" (p. 301); and who dares to say "there was no preaching to the Indians in their own tongue. We may entertain a doubt as to the possibility of the natives having set themselves to read Eliot's Bible, for we have no testimony to that effect" (p. 297). He knows nothing of "Praying Indians", except as converted by the Jesuits, nor of Nonantum, nor of Natick, nor of Mashpee. He has not studied the work of the Mayhews at Martha's Vineyard. He has no adequate conception of the work of the Rev. Thomas Bray nor does he understand that the purpose of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, from the first, was to work among the English settlers in such colonies as had no established church, as well as to have the Gospel preached to the aborigines (p. 321). Akin to this minimization of Protestant missions is the depreciation of everything in the English colonies. He writes that "we may take it that, from Maine to Florida, the only specimens of anything approaching to art were to be found in the Catholic stations of Maryland and Pennsylvania" (p. 557), overlooking the fact that the Anglican church at St. Barnabas in Prince George's County, Md., possessed in Hesselius's painting of the Last Supper a work of probably more importance than those contained in any of the Catholic stations. We are told that the English were not "an important factor in the general civilization of the American continent" (p. 208). We read (p. 223) that Canada was left without help from France and that "General Amherst with regular troops successfully invaded the country in 1760", and wonder why the early years of the French and Indian War and General Wolfe's campaign are omitted.

The bitterness against Cecil, Lord Baltimore (p. 670) is unfortunate. Without him, no Jesuits would have been in Maryland; yet, because he did not do for them all that they asked, he is continually vilified. The distinction between restrictive covenants in a grant of land, such as was made according to the "Conditions of Plantation", and provisions con-

tained in a statute, is ignored (p. 19). Baltimore is attacked for altering the "Conditions", as if laws were changed contrary to the charter (pp. 11, 625). Because he directed that a Jesuit be sent out of the province in a certain contingency, which never occurred, he is accused, for several pages, of kidnapping (p. 621). Because he paid for land to the Indians to extinguish their claim to it, any private citizens, *e. g.*, the Jesuits, are said to have had the right to make such purchase without regard to the proprietary; for "the authority over the land which they occupied was all theirs" [the Indians] (p. 642)—a position which, of course, has no ground at law.

Not only Baltimore is disliked. The author goes out of his way to attack the Rt. Rev. Dr. Inglis, the first Anglican bishop of Nova Scotia (pp. 505, 602). Gov. Horatio Sharpe's character is so misread that he is called a "cipher" (p. 544). Frontenac (p. 342) and Governors Nicholson and Hart of Maryland (pp. 436, 452) are also among those to whom scant justice is given.

Undoubtedly anti-Catholic laws in Maryland in the eighteenth century and efforts of New York governors in the seventeenth century against the Jesuits were partly due to the *odium theologicum*, but the explanation of them is not entirely made, when this is said. One must remember that many Jacobites followed the tenets of the Church of Rome and that the French Jesuits were eager to increase the domains of the King of France—so that politics mingled with religion in these measures.

Some minor errors call for comment, *e. g.*, the *Parlement de Paris* was not a "higher kind of County Council" (p. 240).

It is a pity that our author did not confine himself to a narration of the deeds of the Jesuits, for he tells us much that is of interest concerning them and their careers in the West Indies (p. 575 ff.), New York (p. 145), Philadelphia (p. 500), and among the German immigrants at Lancaster (p. 501). We are interested in the glimpse of the work of Father Lewis in Cecil County, who "was at one and the same time ecclesiastical superior, local pastor attending several missions, procurator of the farm, head of the house, and, as it would seem, a farm-hand too on occasions" (p. 134). We have a novel account of "priests' slaves" (p. 559) and of the sisters of Jesuits who entered convents (pp. 522-524). There is an important appendix, consisting of an accurate list of the English Jesuits who labored in North America, containing, for the first time, information concerning the Maryland men who entered the order (p. 676 ff.).

The account of the Jesuits of Canada is interesting though disjointed (Parkman's name does not occur in the volume!)—the narrative is too long to be a pendant to the history of the work of Jesuits in British North America and too incomplete to be a full history of the work of the Jesuits in the French colonies. It is a thrilling narrative containing such fine thoughts as those expressed by Father de Crépieu,

that there were four wings with which he supported his flight: "grace, the love, the fear of God, zeal for souls". Father de Carheil expressed his duties in five articles: "Servant of God for the sake of God; servant of everybody for God; servant of no one against God; servant of God against everyone; servant of God against oneself" (p. 261).

*New York as an Eighteenth-Century Municipality prior to 1731.*

By ARTHUR EVERETT PETERSON, Ph.D. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. LXXV., no. 1.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1917. Pp. xv, 199. \$2.00.)

*New York as an Eighteenth-Century Municipality, 1731-1776.* By

GEORGE WILLIAM EDWARDS, Ph.D. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. LXXV., no. 2.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1917. Pp. 205. \$2.00.)

THESE two scholarly volumes represent a much to be desired kind of investigation into the government of our municipalities previous to the Revolution. It is to be regretted that New York State, probably less than any other of the thirteen colonies, has been made a field for constitutional and economic studies. Until such are made, a comprehensive history of New York State along such lines will scarcely be undertaken by any one writer.

The two authors of these volumes evidently planned their work in co-operation, and the topics taken up are much the same, though the order of treatment is somewhat different. In both there are introductory chapters devoted to the government followed by others on the regulation of trade and industry, the regulation of lands and streets, ferries, the watch or keeping the peace, fire protection, charities and correction. Dr. Peterson has a special chapter on the dock and Dr. Edwards one on finance. It is to be regretted that the authors did not present a preface to let the readers know how much they worked together, why they divided the field as they did—and in general what points of view they had determined upon in presenting their material.

Another advantage of a preface would be that it might forestall a very likely kind of criticism with reference to origins. As the reader advances through these volumes it becomes patent that the authors have intended to confine their attention very closely to the institutions of New York City as revealed in the *Minutes of the Common Council*. They have not to any appreciable extent sought to find origins in Europe, or to seek explanations for certain customs or institutions by a thorough examination of Dutch and English municipal practices. Even when mention is made of such similarity exact references are lacking (pp. 47, 49 of Peterson).

The tendency to restrict their vision to the city documents is responsible for the absence of some illuminating side-lights which could have been drawn perhaps from a closer study of the colonial legislation. For

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—43.

example, in connection with the regulation of commerce and industry (chapter II. of Peterson), though fairs and markets are included, no mention is made of the extremely interesting law of 1692 (*Laws of the Colony of New York*, I. 296-300), where are set up

two fairs at the City of New-York, the first fair annually to commence the last Tuesday of Aprill in every year and to end upon the fryday then next following being in all four days inclusive and no Longer, And the second fair to commence the first Tuesday of November in every year, and to end upon the fryday then next following being in all four days inclusive and no Longer,

and where is authorized the establishment of "Courts of Pypowder", and in fact all of the conditions surrounding a full system of English fairs.

One is led to believe (p. 69, Peterson) that apprenticeship in industry was an institution of early New York of English origin only, whereas there are indentures in existence showing that the Dutch as well as the English carried on the common European practice (O'Callaghan, *Calendar of Dutch Manuscripts*, p. 44). Dr. Edwards in his chapter on trade and industry (pp. 61-95) does not deal with this subject at all, though it is during the period he covers rather than that covered by Dr. Peterson that this institution flourished most vigorously.

Other instances might be given to show the dangers of a too close restriction to the consideration of the city proceedings only, but sins of omission are never to be much emphasized.

An excellent quality, especially evident in Dr. Peterson's volume, is found in the use of the comparison of early conditions with those of the present day. This serves to enliven the narrative and constantly reminds the reader of how really old some of our problems of municipal government are. For that reason no student of present-day New York City conditions should fail to turn to these two volumes in order to get a detailed and highly illuminating view of municipal institutions. Those who are inclined to feel that all ills are of the present and blessings only of the past will do well to read them.

There is a very detailed table of contents in both volumes, but indexes, and lists of books used and referred to, are very much missed. These are not entirely compensated for by the table of contents and very careful references to authorities at the foot of each page.

JAMES SULLIVAN.

*Warren-Adams Letters, being chiefly a Correspondence among John Adams, Samuel Adams, and James Warren. Volume I., 1743-1777. [Massachusetts Historical Society, Collections, vol. LXXII.] (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society. 1917. Pp. xxxi, 382. \$3.00.)*

BESIDE the principal content of this work, as indicated by the subtitle, the present volume contains the correspondence of Mercy Warren,

wife of James Warren, with John and Abigail Adams, Hannah Winthrop, and others, including several letters from her husband. A smaller element is some earlier correspondence of James Otis. The earliest of these is a letter from young Otis to his father, in 1743; the next is a letter from Otis to his sister (Mercy Warren), in 1766; and these are followed by four letters from John Dickinson to Otis, in 1767 and 1768, and a letter from Catharine Macaulay, in 1769. The correspondence between Samuel Adams and James Warren begins in 1771, that between Warren and John Adams in 1774. There are in the volume approximately 250 letters, of which more than 200 were written by John Adams, Samuel Adams, and James Warren, and of these John Adams wrote nearly half. There are no letters from James Warren to Samuel Adams. The editor has purposely omitted, with three or four exceptions, the letters from John Adams to James Warren (of which there are fifteen) printed in John Adams's *Works*. Of the letters of Samuel Adams here printed (fifty in number) about one-third are found in Cushing's edition of Samuel Adams's *Writings*. On the other hand there are several letters from Adams to Warren printed by Cushing which are not found in this volume. It is to be observed that Cushing used for the most part the drafts of Adams's letters now deposited in the New York Public Library, whereas the present texts are printed from the letters actually sent. A comparison of the respective texts shows in general only verbal variations, yet, in a few instances, the letters sent contain considerable additions, or modifications of the drafts.

From this general survey of the contents it will be recognized that the volume contains a large measure of essentially new material; new, that is, in much of its content, although not new in character and quality. There is little, indeed, in the whole volume that does not relate directly to the all-important question of defending American rights against ministerial aggression, and the parts which the principal writers played in that contest are well known. Dickinson's letters to Otis, for instance, relate principally to the *Farmer's Letters*, then being presented to the public, and emphasize his views. Letters of James Warren, one of the principal participants in the Massachusetts phase of the Revolution, have been less accessible than those of either John or Samuel Adams. Concerning the Massachusetts phase of the contest his letters are of especial value. The letters of the Adamses, written as the majority of them were from their seats in the Continental Congress, are particularly informing, concerning the transactions of that body. Both of them are, however, much concerned with affairs in Massachusetts, and are prone to view the struggle from the Massachusetts point of view, although, of the two, John Adams reveals a broader outlook, a clearer vision. While the new letters in the volume are without striking revelations concerning the views, attitudes, aspirations, or predilections of the writers, they do enlarge our knowledge of plans, purposes, and motives, do put us in closer touch with personalities great and small. For this is chiefly the correspondence of intimate personal friends.

The feminine writers whose letters find place in the volume sound no less a note of high resolve and patriotic purpose than the men. Abigail Adams and Mercy Warren are familiar figures in the political and literary history of the Revolution. Hannah Winthrop, if one may judge from the few letters of hers here presented, deserves a place near the other two. She wields a facile pen, one from which flows a lofty rhetoric, now well-nigh forgotten.

There are several facsimiles in the volume, including the resolution of secrecy passed by the Continental Congress in November, 1775, and signed by members, from time to time, as late as June, 1777. The editorial work is essentially all that could be asked. Attention however needs to be called to the fact that the letter of John Adams to James Warren, bearing date of February 11, 1775, belongs instead in the year 1776.

E. C. B.

*The History of Legislative Methods in the Period before 1825.* By RALPH VOLNEY HARLOW, Ph.D. [Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, V.] (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1917. Pp. x, 269. \$2.25.)

To the student of American history and politics this volume will be of considerable interest. Dr. Harlow has evidently made a detailed study of the committees in the legislatures of the American colonies, and further he has given serious attention to the party organizations, juntas, and political combinations which entered into colonial legislative processes.

In the chapter on Standing Committees in the Colonial Legislatures, 1750-1775, little new information is furnished, and the brief résumé of the subject given by the author is marred by several errors, which shake one's faith in the thoroughness of this part of his work. On page 12 one finds the following statement: "Why the committee on trade should have been appointed in 1742 is not so clear, but the committee for religion, created in 1769, was certainly the outgrowth of local conditions." The *Journals of the Virginia House of Burgesses, 1727-1740* and 1742-1749, make it very clear why this committee was appointed. A standing committee was appointed in the first session of the assembly of 1736-1740 "to prepare and draw up a State of that Duty [the duty on slaves imported into the colony] and the several Paiments that have been made, with the Amount thereof". This committee, reappointed in two other sessions of this assembly, became in 1742 the standing committee on trade. On page 13 one finds the statement that in 1775 Dinwiddie wrote to Halifax, "that our Assembly met", etc. Dinwiddie was lieutenant-governor of Virginia only from 1751-1758, and as he died in 1770 and Halifax died in 1771, it is certain that 1775 was not the date of this

correspondence. On page 18 it is stated that the committee of correspondence which communicated with the colonial agent was in some cases a regular standing committee, but in others, because named by statute, a commission or board rather than a legislative committee. Even when created by statute these committees were composed of members of the legislative bodies, who were amenable to the legislature. Any study of their records will show that their work was closely followed by the legislatures from which they were appointed. Dr. Harlow's contention that because they were named by statute they were commissions and not committees seems to be a distinction without a real difference. These committees were essentially legislative in nature and by appointment, and their records and correspondence were laid before the assembly at each session. This committee in several of the colonies was utilized in 1773 and 1774 for the intercolonial correspondence which resulted in the calling of the first Continental Congress. The reviewer deems the committee for communicating with the agent of great importance, despite the fact that Dr. Harlow dismisses it with the barest mention.

The best chapters are those dealing with party organization and the legislative juntas in the various colonies, and here Dr. Harlow has done an excellent piece of work, pointing out in a most interesting manner the workings of the colonial political machines. The chapters entitled Republicanism in the House, the Jeffersonian Régime, and Madison and Congress are well-written accounts of the struggle between the Jeffersonian and Hamiltonian ideas. The author has stated both sides of the controversy with balance and fairness, though possibly he gives too much weight to the opinions of Fisher Ames, who was intensely partizan and undemocratic.

The book is of excellent print, well indexed, but has no bibliography—a matter of regret although the extensive and numerous foot-notes are a partial compensation. In spite of some errors the work as a whole is commendable and Dr. Harlow has shown ability both in research and as a writer of history.

JAMES MILLER LEAKE.

*Audubon the Naturalist: a History of his Life and Time.* By FRANCIS HOBART HERRICK, Ph.D., Sc.D., Professor of Biology in Western Reserve University. In two volumes. (New York and London: D. Appleton and Company. 1917. Pp. xl, 451; xiii, 494. \$7.50.)

JOHN JAMES AUDUBON was an ornithologist, artist, explorer, and publisher. Comparatively few people have seen the monumental volumes which formed his life-work and his fame rests upon the attractiveness of his personality, the romance of his life, and his unparalleled record of achievement in making the results of his labors known to the world, rather than upon his actual accomplishments as a naturalist—great as they were. It is not without reason, therefore, that Audubon



has been a favorite subject with biographers; but we have no hesitation in expressing our belief that the history of this remarkable man is adequately presented for the first time in Professor Herrick's scholarly volumes. Himself an ardent lover of birds, he writes in full sympathy with his subject, but with the fairness of the scientist and the thoroughness of one trained in methods of research.

The contents of these two well-made volumes may best be made known by a chronological review of the more significant events in Audubon's life.

Chief among Professor Herrick's surprisingly numerous discoveries of new facts concerning Audubon's early life is the hitherto unknown place and date of his birth. Heretofore it has generally been believed that Audubon was born at Mandeville, Louisiana, May 5, 1780. It appears, however, that he first saw the light at Les Cayes, Hayti, April 26, 1785. At the age of four he was taken by his father to the latter's home in Nantes, France. Here, and at the commune of Couëron, he lived until his eighteenth year, and it was during this time that he received his limited education, including a brief period of instruction in drawing under Jacques Louis David, at Paris.

Although in travelling from his birthplace to his childhood's home, Audubon had passed through the United States, his first real contact with the country of his adoption dates from 1803 when, at the age of eighteen, he settled at "Mill Grove" farm near Philadelphia. Here, in 1804, he became engaged to Lucy Green Bakewell, to whose single-hearted devotion to him and his pursuits Audubon owed no small measure of his success. In 1807 he served for a short time as a clerk in a New York commission house, and in August of that year went to Louisville, Kentucky, by way of Pittsburgh, and the Ohio River, to open a trading store. For the succeeding thirteen years he engaged in various business ventures but, handicapped by tastes which not only gave him no interest in commerce, but left him small time for its pursuit, he failed alike in all and in 1820 accepted a position as taxidermist in the Western Museum which had just been founded by Dr. Daniel Drake in Cincinnati.

Although from his boyhood's days in France Audubon's chief interest in life had been the study and painting of birds, it was not until 1820, or when he had reached the age of thirty-five, that he conceived the idea of publishing a work upon them. This date marks his awakening. All his latent forces were called into action and from this hour until the final years of his life he worked with astounding and ceaseless energy. The ensuing four years were devoted to the study of bird-life in the lower Mississippi region, chiefly about New Orleans, portrait-painting and Mrs. Audubon's teaching meanwhile supporting him and his family; and in 1824 he went to Philadelphia to find a publisher for his work, visiting also Lakes Ontario and Champlain to gather more material for it. Disappointed in the main object of his visit he re-

turned to New Orleans, descending the Ohio in a skiff, and, after a year's teaching, sailed, in 1826, from that city for Liverpool.

England accorded Audubon the recognition which America had denied him. Within five months of his arrival the engraver began work upon the first of his plates, the Turkey Cock, which, shown the size of life, established the scale of his great folios. The succeeding three years were more than occupied with making drawings and securing subscribers for his work, for it must be remembered that Audubon launched his magnificent enterprise on a capital of enthusiasm and conviction, the product of genius aflame, and for the thirteen years it was in press he lived, as it were, from subscriber to engraver.

In 1829 Audubon sailed for America; in 1830, after visiting various cities in quest of subscribers, he sailed for Liverpool. The following year was passed in London and Edinburgh, and in August, 1831, he again returned to the fields and forests whence he acquired both his information and inspiration. The winter of 1831 was passed on the south Atlantic coast, where, at Charleston, he first met his subsequent collaborator John Bachman. In the spring of 1832 he explored the Florida Keys, and in the summer of the same year, the coasts of Maine and New Brunswick. Labrador was visited the following year and in April, 1834, he crossed the Atlantic and, settling in Edinburgh, resumed work upon his *Ornithological Biography*, the text which accompanied his plates.

Returning to America in August, 1836, Audubon passed the winter drawing at Charleston, and in the spring of the following year travelled overland to New Orleans and thence cruised along the Gulf to Galveston. In July of the same year he sailed for the fourth and last time to England, where he remained until the completion of his work in 1839.

The years 1840-1842, spent in New York City, were devoted to the preparation and production of a seven-volume octavo edition of his *Birds of America*, a canvassing tour to Quebec, to work upon his *Quadrupeds of North America*, and to planning his trip of 1843 up the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers.

The succeeding three years were given to making the illustrations for the last-named work (of which Bachman supplied the text). In 1847 he was forced to lay aside brush and pen. For more than a quarter of a century he had worked, as it were, under forced draft. With failing powers even the fires of genius waned and four years later he died at his home on the Hudson.

*The Ashley-Smith Explorations and the Discovery of a Central Route to the Pacific, 1822-1829.* With the Original Journals, edited by HARRISON CLIFFORD DALE, Professor of Political Science in the University of Wyoming. (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1918. Pp. 352. \$5.00.)

GENERAL WILLIAM H. ASHLEY and Jedediah Smith are familiar figures to the student of the history of the fur-trade. Professor Dale

has added details here and there, has corrected minor errors of earlier writers, and has made accessible 130 pages of original material, but the main outlines of our previous conceptions remain unchanged. The documents make it possible to trace with accuracy most of the route of Ashley in 1824-1825, to fill in the movements of Smith and his men in southern California during December, 1826, and January, 1827, and to correct about 250 miles of the route which the Smith party traversed in 1828. The biographies are accurate, detailed, and well documented, but are rather heavy reading. As an historian the author appears to be lacking in perspective, a fault which may be corrected by a more extended examination of the voluminous materials for the history of the fur-trade.

The introductory chapter, which deals with the explorations of fur-traders to 1822, is the least satisfactory part of the book. The author is familiar with the fur-trade in the Missouri and Columbia valleys, but the southwest is a sealed book to him. The period before 1803 is given but slight attention, and the early history of Astor and the work of Choteau and De Munn are ignored. One important contribution is made in the chapter, for the author settles the question concerning the date of the discovery of South Pass.

In the second section Ashley's career up to 1824 is presented in a detailed narrative. When the author reaches the expedition of 1824-1825, he lets Ashley tell his own story in a letter to General Henry Atkinson, the document being taken from the Ashley manuscripts of the Missouri Historical Society. Professor Dale's intimate knowledge of the region traversed enabled him to do an unusually good piece of editing. The section closes with an account of Ashley's later career.

The third division, devoted to the life of Smith, is less satisfactory than that devoted to Ashley, not because the work is less carefully done, but because the sources are incomplete. Most of the space is taken up by three documents. The first is Smith's letter to General William Clark, which summarizes the expedition of 1826-1827. It has been printed twice before and was used by previous historians. Of more importance are the journals of Smith's clerk, Harrison G. Rogers, from the originals which belong to the Missouri Historical Society. The first journal tells of the sojourn of Smith's party at the San Gabriel mission and the journey eastward to San Bernardino. The second journal gives a detailed account of the movements of Smith's band from the Trinity River in California to the Umpqua River.

A few statements need correction. The government did not abandon its support of western exploration with the return of Lewis and Clark (p. 26); Pike was sent on his second expedition by Wilkinson and not by the government (p. 53); the Santa Fé road was surveyed, but not constructed, at government expense (pp. 291-292); the statement that

there was little in common between the fur-trade and the Santa Fé trade has been disproven (p. 293).

The book contains a reprint of Gallatin's map of 1826, and a map showing the routes of Ashley and Smith. It is to be regretted that Ashley's route of 1824-1825 was not shown on a larger scale. The author rejects the usual conception of Smith's return route from California in 1827, but the evidence in the text does not seem to justify the change. If Professor Dale had had at his disposal certain books and articles which are not listed in his bibliography, he would have been saved several of the errors and omissions which have been noted. The volume has an excellent index and is beautifully printed.

THOMAS MAITLAND MARSHALL.

*Uncollected Letters of Abraham Lincoln.* Now first brought together by GILBERT A. TRACY. With an Introduction by IDA M. TARBELL. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1917. Pp. xxi, 264. \$2.50.)

LINCOLN was no correspondent; he wrote only on occasion; every letter was an action. Like his acts, even the most minute are instinct with his individuality: as, "You request an autograph and here it is. A. Lincoln" (p. 148). Simple and naked of ornament, as he appears to be, yet almost every new scrap of evidence seems necessary to the complete picture; his reaction to every new angle of circumstance adds to our understanding of him. It is a real material contribution, therefore, when additional letters are published.

The present collection contains about three hundred, mostly short. The great majority are now printed for the first time, the place of previous printing being given where this is not the case. They run from October 6, 1836, to March 29, 1865. More than half fall between March 4, 1855, and March 4, 1861, the years of his great political activity. The relative importance of the contribution of this period is somewhat diminished by the fact that it contains most of the reprinted letters. The editing is well done.

There are many law letters, showing Lincoln's care and honesty, but of no other general interest. Yet there is an occasional flash. Who can fail to see "Mr. Isaac E. Button" whom he recommended to look after some real estate: "a trustworthy man and one whom the Lord made on purpose for such business" (p. 12). His earlier political letters show both his native sense of fair play, the careful exactness of his political methods, and his keen psychological insight. "In doing this, let nothing be said against Hardin . . . nothing deserves to be said against him" (p. 16). ". . . have made alphabetical lists of all the voters. . . . This will not be a heavy job, and you will see how, like a map, it lays the whole field before you" (p. 78). "He [Taylor] must occasionally say, or seem to say, 'by the Eternal', 'I take the

responsibility'. Those phrases were the 'Samson's locks' of General Jackson" (p. 40).

Perhaps the most valuable new letter between 1855 and 1861 is that criticizing suggested corrections in his Cooper Union speech, which illustrates his total absence of literary vanity, and his exacting study of correct expression (pp. 149-151).

The letters of the presidential period are probably of the greatest new interest. A letter to the King of Siam succeeds in being courtly without excluding individuality, in the delightful clause, thanking his Majesty for "two elephants' tusks of length and magnitude such as indicate that they could have belonged only to an animal which was a native of Siam" (p. 202). His wide conception of the forces creating public opinion is illustrated by his suggestion, in 1863, to Bayard Taylor, that he give a lecture on "Serfs, Serfdom, and Emancipation in Russia" (p. 237). His own patience is shown by his repeated requests to his subordinates to hear patiently various claimants, who have passed through his hands. Sometimes he orders action, usually on some such ground as, "There is some peculiar reason for it" (p. 194): a form, hinting political pressure, which saves him from the appearance of dictating on grounds of judgment. Usually he leaves the subordinate free to act, but asks that something be done; for instance "in any not unreasonable way" (p. 242). Frequently he jocularly passes on applicants as: "I do not personally know these ladies, but cheerfully endorse Judge Wylie and Mayor Wallock" [obviously their endorsers] (p. 249).

On the whole not many new particular facts are brought out in these letters, but our picture of Lincoln is both confirmed and substantially broadened, and they, of themselves, are sufficient to make their readers lovers of Lincoln.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

*The Memoirs of Colonel John S. Mosby.* Edited by CHARLES WELLS RUSSELL. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1917. Pp. xxi, 414. \$3.00.)

IF the present generation of Americans were more familiar than it is with the events of the American Civil War, it would be better able to comprehend and classify such details as are made known to us concerning the present war. A generation of Americans grown up in an era of profound peace, an era controlled largely by feminine standards, is shocked, when war suddenly startles their gentle world, by incidents and details that have attended every war in human history.

To such, the reading of Colonel Mosby's memoirs may be a preventive of hysteria, a preservative of sanity. Mosby once wrecked a Union railroad train which was running to Sheridan's army then in the Shenandoah valley. The train carried, besides army supplies, a number of civilian passengers, including some women. The entirely correct

comment recorded in Colonel Mosby's memoirs upon this war-time expedient is that people who travel upon a railroad train in a country where military operations are going on take the risk of all the accidents of war. He adds: "I was not conducting an insurance business on life and property."

Again, when Mosby was informed that a number of women and children from among persons in the North, who sympathized with the South, would be placed on the trains running to Sheridan, the purpose of this familiar device, of course, being to make the trains safe from his attack, he replied that he did not understand that it hurt women and children to be killed any more than it hurt men. In November, 1864, he wrote a letter to General Sheridan, which can be considered with profit by Americans to-day. Sheridan had captured six of Mosby's men and had them shot. Mosby wrote to Sheridan that after this had been done he had captured more than seven hundred of Sheridan's men and had sent them to Richmond, but that now having taken prisoners from Custer's division, the command which had executed the six Confederates, he had executed seven of them. Thereafter, he announced, his captives would be treated as prisoners of war unless new grounds were given for retaliation. The exchange of this particular manifestation of military courtesy here came to an end.

Alternating through these interesting memoirs are narratives of daring exploits, the accounts of which sometimes disagree substantially with the Northern official reports of the same affairs, and serious studies of several important battles and campaigns, including the first Bull Run battle and the Gettysburg campaign. Colonel Mosby was a free lance both in war and in peace. With him a report or despatch carried weight according to its degree of accuracy. A great name signed to it, whether it was Lee's, Longstreet's, or Johnston's, did not deter him from pointing out its error, if error existed.

He says that the Confederacy was lost at the battle of Bull Run because of the failure of Johnston and Beauregard to press on to the capture of Washington. He lays at rest finally, and without hope of resurrection, the view advanced by Confederate soldiers and biographers and by so many historians, North and South, that Lee's cavalry leader, Stuart, by his absence from the army lost the battle of Gettysburg. He shows that Stuart was absent from Lee's army during the preliminary movements in accordance with the directions of Lee and Longstreet. He disposes finally of that persistent and picturesque story that Longstreet's scout, Harrison, brought to Lee in Pennsylvania the first information that the Army of the Potomac was marching northward through Maryland. He visits merited criticism upon the movements of General Joseph E. Johnston, who began to retire before his opponents early in the year 1861, and continued retiring, much as General Nathanael Greene did in 1781, until the end of the war.

The truth is that few of the military movements, North or South, on a large scale during the Civil War will bear serious scrutiny, and most of the histories of the war will bear less. The best books relating to it are still the special books like Colonel Mosby's, Major John Bigelow's *Chancellorsville*, the *Fredericksburg* by Colonel Henderson of the British army, and Colonel Haskell's spirited and contemporary narrative, occasionally inaccurate in detail, of the Gettysburg battle. So little adaptability to scientific military processes have the American people shown that after more than a half-century they have failed to discover what was best done in the Civil War and of what was ill done they know only the most glaring examples.

ISAAC R. PENNYPACKER.

*A History of the United States since the Civil War.* By ELLIS PAXSON OBERHOLTZER. In five volumes. Volume I., 1865-1868. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1917. Pp. xi, 579. \$3.50.)

THERE is something very unconventional and business-like in the manner of Dr. Oberholtzer's entrance upon this serious undertaking. He gives us no preface—not even a "foreword", no introduction, no bibliographical note, no brief synopsis of his interpretation of history in general and of American history in particular, no acknowledgments of valuable aid from assorted librarians and specialists, no deprecatory suggestions aimed at possible reviewers. He does, indeed, present a table of contents; but promptly at the conclusion of that the first chapter of the history opens briskly and precisely "On Sunday morning, April 2, 1865". Where the story is going to end is nowhere stated. Probably the author does not know and does not care to guess. All that he feels reasonably sure of is that it will be five volumes long. He has before him the cases of Rhodes and McMaster, and seeks to profit by their examples. McMaster named at the outset both the number of his volumes and the end of his story; he made good on the latter point, but his completed work shows eight volumes instead of the five that he announced. Rhodes said nothing about the number of volumes, but fixed the end of his story at 1884; his completed work, if it is completed, ends at 1877. Oberholtzer will be able to fulfill his promise of five volumes by the simple expedient of stopping the story at the end of volume five.

The present volume covers only three years. Of the eight chapters three deal with the political struggle over reconstruction, four with social and economic conditions after the war, and one with foreign relations that especially affected America—"Mexico, Ireland, and Alaska". This distribution of the writer's attention indicates very well the general type of his work. It is in the school of McMaster. It will tell the story of the American People as a social rather than a political entity. It will be as catholic in its scope as the satire of Juvenal:



Quidquid agunt homines, votum timor ira voluptas  
Gaudia discursus, nostri farrago libelli est.

It will depict the life of the people but will not seek to interpret it. The reader will see the rush and hear the roar of a busy nation on its way, but be left to himself to guess whither it is going.

Dr. Oberholtzer commands a style that fulfills admirably the requirements of this kind of historiography. The narrative never fails to be interesting. At times, however, the impression of highly feverish movement is made too strong for strict accuracy. By the mere unconscious speeding up of the machinery the film gives to many a scene that was in fact as placid as Broad Street, Philadelphia, the breathless hurly-burly of Broadway, New York.

In the political part of the narrative the exciting story of the conflict between the President and Congress is told with judicial spirit, sound judgment, and full information. The author manifests no overwhelming admiration for either Andrew Johnson or the leading radicals who opposed him. Small errors seem to have crept into the text in reference to Generals Sickles and Miles. It is stated (p. 447) that Miles, when relieved from duty as custodian of Jefferson Davis, was "mustered out of the service"; and the running head of the page is "Miles dismissed". These expressions imply that the general left the army in deep disgrace, and the reader wonders how it came about that he figured so largely in the Indian wars of later years and in the war with Spain, and rose to be lieutenant-general. The explanation of course is, that his "mustering out" in 1866 had no connection with his course as jailer of Davis, but was merely an incident in the dissolution of the volunteer army. Miles remained in the regular army as colonel.

General Sickles's retirement from command in the Carolinas is wrapped in some obscurity in the text. He is said to have "resigned" but not to have been relieved from command (p. 458), and there is no mention of the very important episode that precipitated his actual relief, namely, his collision with Chief Justice Chase, presiding at the U. S. circuit court sitting at Raleigh.

Dr. Oberholtzer's chapters on general social conditions in South, North, and the growing West present an extremely interesting and useful view of the nation in the middle and later sixties. The variety of topics touched upon is necessarily a bit confusing at times and severely tests the author's ingenuity in devising transitions. It is to be remembered, however, that events and the forces uniting them are in actual manifestation simultaneous, while in historical narration they have to be consecutive. In view of this sad incongruity perhaps the nearest approach possible to a picture in print of the actual life of a lustrum in a great population is some such chapter as that which rather incoherently unites, along with other things, the Atlantic Cable, Inflation of the Currency, Trade at Panama, Chicago, Bridges and Horse

Railroads, Nitroglycerine, Immigration from Europe, Discovery of Petroleum, and Riotous Living.

The chapter entitled *Beyond the Mississippi* is particularly useful in fixing the salient facts of the situation just at the time when the trans-continental railroads were about to bring such amazing changes. The one unpardonable defect at this point is the lack of a map to make intelligible the development of the mining territories and states and the relation to it of the Indian problems and campaigns. The author might do well, also, to devote a few months to forgetting all the things he knows about the building of the Union Pacific Railroad and its branches, and then, having put himself in approximately the position of his readers, read over his account of these events, especially page 327, and see if he gets a perfectly clear conception of what happened.

The Fenian movement receives in this volume a treatment that has not the fault, at least, of undue brevity. Dr. Oberholtzer reveals somewhat of impatience and contempt for the whole affair, while picturing its details with much fullness. It was indeed a preposterous performance—though scarcely more so than Young Ireland before it, and Sinn Fein after. The author's preoccupation with the inherent absurdity of the Irishmen's enterprise doubtless made him overlook some implications of the passage describing Stephens, the chief leader, or in the phrase of the times, "Head Center", of the Fenian organization: "He was a small, thick-set, wiry man. He now wore a full beard and was quite bald. In no way did he seem to be the great leader of a national revolution" (p. 529). Must we understand that an Irishman who was able to be at the same time thickset and wiry was *ipso facto* doomed to failure in the quest for a Hibernian republic? Or that distinction as a revolutionist is never to be expected by a bald man with a beard?

In conclusion, while we are touching the small points, attention may be called to an example of the havoc that may be wrought by the intrusion of so insignificant a matter as a comma. On page 182 Balak's command on a familiar historical occasion (Numbers, xxiii. 7) is printed thus: "Come curse me, Israel". This is as disconcerting and as disastrous to the sense as the other instance that has been told, where likewise a comma crept into position after the pronoun in the command: "Saddle me the ass".

WM. A. DUNNING.

*Burrows of Michigan and the Republican Party: a Biography and a History.* By WILLIAM DANA ORCUTT. In two volumes. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1917. Pp. ix, 357; 369. \$6.00.)

THE late Senator Burrows left "twenty voluminous scrap-books" in which he had "pasted clippings, letters, and memoranda" (I. 11),

but he wrote few letters, and "his diary is written upon the pages of the *Congressional Record* and in the stenographers' reports of his public speeches" (I. vii). It has accordingly been necessary for his biographer to restrict his activity to the public life of his subject, and it has been impossible for him to draw a real portrait or to show Burrows against his environment, as, for instance, Senator Foraker did for himself. Burrows and Foraker were near enough of an age and of contemporary activity to have made their comparison an interesting and useful task. Foraker died fighting, and resented to the end the existence of a school of critics whom he could not understand and who would not understand him. Burrows, on the other hand, equally a remnant of the receding political moraine, did not know that he was left behind, and seems to have continued satisfied and unperturbed throughout his life. "'Burrows does not know his own strength,' Foraker once said of him" (II. 331). Both were effective speakers and driving fighters. Foraker was more of the fiery spellbinder type, Burrows showed a stronger intellectual content. As enemies, Foraker's espousal of the cause of the Brownsville negro regiment brought out the strength of the seasoned party man as did Burrows's long and vain attack upon Senator Smoot of Utah. Each had the courage to dissent from the opinion of his party but both chose more often the path of stubborn support of and confidence in the old machine.

There is no evidence given in either of the two fine volumes of Mr. Orcutt's life to warrant its opening assertion that, "The life history of Julius Caesar Burrows is so closely interwoven with that of the Republican Party that the one can never be told without embracing the chief events of the other" (I. 3), or, with different metaphor, "The story of his life, then, is no unrhymed heroic poem, for the cantos were composed by the nation itself, and the rhymes by the man portrayed" (II. 313). In Burrows's earlier days Blaine so far surpassed him in leadership and Hayes in insight that he becomes but a minor character. The rising influence of Reed and McKinley left him still in the second rank through his whole middle period. At the last, with Hanna at the helm and Roosevelt charting a new course, he was obsolete before he was retired. He never attained first rank as a speaker upon greenbacks or tariff or silver or the trusts. He will remain a minor figure "in his constructive usefulness to his party" (I. 3).

It was to Senator Burrows that McKinley turned in 1897 for confidential opinion upon the fitness of General Alger to become secretary of war; and only after Burrows's guarantee, based upon investigations through Thomas C. Platt, "to defend him against any possible assault on his record" (II. 103), did the nomination ensue. General Shafter, like Burrows and Alger, came from Michigan, and further knowledge may perhaps uncover the channel of influence through which Miles was set aside from field command while Shafter took the expeditionary force to Cuba. Of the two appointments, Alger and Shafter, the latter was

probably the more menacing. The unpreparedness of the United States would have covered any secretary of war with criticism; only the strength and courage of the subordinates kept the Santiago campaign from wreck.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

*Samuel Jordan Kirkwood.* By DAN ELBERT CLARK. [Iowa Biographical Series, edited by Benjamin F. Shambaugh.] (Iowa City: State Historical Society. 1917. Pp. xiv, 464. \$2.00.)

THE plan of Professor Shambaugh to illuminate the history of Iowa through a series of biographies of the state's leading men is one which might well be adopted in other commonwealths. Samuel J. Kirkwood as Iowa's "war governor" finds a fitting, and, indeed, necessary place in such a series, and in Mr. Clark the editor secured a suitable writer for the volume. Care has been exercised, labor has been expended in a study of letter-books and other sources to bring together material not earlier utilized in Lathrop's *Life*.

Kirkwood was a type of American which made itself a large formative factor in our political life fifty or seventy-five years ago. He was Scottish and Irish in ancestry. Born in Maryland he trekked west over the Cumberland Road to Ohio. He performed farm labor and taught country school. He read law and was admitted to the bar. A Democrat before the Nebraska issue came forward, he joined the new Republican party, and at about the same time removed to Iowa. A rather rough man externally, careless of dress, vigorous of speech, he became a picturesque and effective campaigner for the new party, and in 1859, only four years after his arrival in Iowa, he won the governorship, which he held for two terms, leading that strong, thrifty, new group of people in the performance of their honorable part in the war.

For a little while in 1866-1867 Kirkwood was United States senator. In 1875 he was again governor of the state, resigning after a year in office to take a full term in the Senate, which he in turn abandoned after four years to enter Garfield's cabinet as Secretary of the Interior. Twice he seems to have declined diplomatic posts, first in Denmark and later in Turkey.

At some points Mr. Clark is able to bring Kirkwood's life into contact with national history, though in general the connection is not very essential or close. It is interesting to know of the efforts which Harlan was making at home to get back his seat in the Senate months before he resigned his place as Secretary of the Interior in Andrew Johnson's cabinet, just prior to the Philadelphia convention of 1866. It was in a way his by fair right. He could go no farther with Johnson. But Kirkwood's ambition to be a United States senator was active and constant, and his biographer, in sympathy with his subject, as biographers are rather bound to be, makes it appear that it was not quite as it should have been when a compromise was reached, Kirkwood being given a

year on account of Harlan's unexpired term, still unfilled by appointment of the governor, while Harlan was returned for the full succeeding six years, to sit with Grimes during the impeachment proceedings.

What Kirkwood might have done in this emergency is not particularly stated. But there is no reason to think that he was of heroic mould. He would have broken with Grimes and voted as Harlan did. There is evidence of this in his course at a public meeting convened to read Grimes out of the party, though the author, being unable to find a report of what Kirkwood said at this time, glazes over the incident. In similar wise it is rather remarkable (p. 313), attesting to deficiency of material or else to an almost uncanny shrewdness in Kirkwood, that nothing is at hand whereon to base an opinion as to his attitude on reconstruction while he sat in the Senate of the United States from January, 1866, to March, 1867. Any man in Washington who could conceal his feelings during this period was a past-master in diplomacy, and one cannot but think it a mistake that when the opportunity offered he should not have turned his steps toward Denmark or Turkey.

ELLIS P. OBERHOLTZER.

*Joseph H. Choate: New Englander, New Yorker, Lawyer, Ambassador.* By THERON G. STRONG. (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company. 1917. Pp. xvii, 390. \$3.00.)

THIS biography should be read by every lawyer in the country who has the money to buy, or the friend from whom he can borrow the book. No man was better qualified than the author for the work that he undertook. Himself of legal lineage, of New England stock and of high standing at the New York Bar, he had already trained his pen when writing his reminiscences. In his *Landmarks of a Lawyer's Lifetime* he had preserved for posterity a record of the appearance and peculiarities of the noted lawyers in New York in his day, who had then passed before him.

The book which he has now published was written with the approval of his subject, who gave him much material. Not the least valuable of this is the sketch of the Choate family with its record of that "simple intellectual life" which was characteristic of the aristocracy of New England until this was supplanted by the plutocracy of the twentieth century. Much of the book was evidently written before Mr. Choate died. This is apparent in the chapter which describes him as a lawyer, which once speaks as if he were still alive (p. 135), and which contains the only error that the reviewer has been able to discover, a reference to Rufus as the uncle of Joseph, which was the general belief of the Bar and which must consequently have been written before the latter gave the author the information contained in an earlier chapter as to the degree of kinship between them. The author's modesty has made him omit what would have increased the value of the book to the student of

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—44.

history, namely, the annexation of notes to his accounts of the different trials, with references to the descriptions of the opposing counsel which are contained in his *Landmarks of a Lawyer's Lifetime*.

The narrative is clear and full of interesting quotations from speeches and cross-examinations. There is a refreshing absence of letters, which are the filling and the bane of most biographies. The book is written in that perfect taste which is the concomitant of high breeding. The eulogy is discriminating and nowhere exaggerated. And the limitations of the hero are stated with justice in language that can offend no one. The arrangement is skillful, not chronological but grouping the incidents in the different phases of the career of that great advocate.

For as an advocate Joseph H. Choate was great, greater than any of his time; some believe the greatest advocate the world has ever seen, although he usually avoided a retainer in criminal cases, with the exception of the contempt proceeding before Judge Smyth, never, so far as the reviewer has been able to ascertain, having appeared in any except those which affected the validity of combination of capital or the culpability of corporations. The case which decided the unconstitutionality of the income tax of 1894 was the most important legal decision of his time and none since the creation of the Supreme Court of the United States was won against greater obstacles. No one ever succeeded in so many cases involving such large sums of money. None ever possessed a style of oratory so suitable for advocacy. None exemplified with such perfection the truth of the maxim that the greatest art is that which conceals its existence.

ROGER FOSTER.

*American Civil Church Law.* By CARL ZOLLMANN, LL.B. [Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, vol. LXXVII., no. 181.] (New York: Columbia University. 1917. Pp. 473. \$3.50.)

It has been often said that our official reports of judicial decisions are important repositories of historical material. It is from them that Mr. Zollmann has compiled his book. He does not profess to explore for himself the course of ecclesiastical history in the United States, but is content to accept whatever the courts have said about it as the final word. He has produced a digest rather than a treatise. He has not even gone to the trouble of examining for himself the sources on which judges may rely in preparing their opinions. Thus, in stating (p. 15) the respect paid to the Christian religion in American government, his reference is to "Swift's System of Laws, Vol. II, p. 825, cited in 11 S. and R. 404".

The style of expression often falls below the dignity of his subject (see pp. 18, 45), but there is no obscurity in what is said.

Mr. Zollmann calls attention to an interesting development of church law by treaty. In that with Spain it is stipulated that the cessions of territory by her to us cannot impair rights belonging to the peaceable

possession of property of ecclesiastical bodies having the legal capacity to acquire and possess property there. The Roman Catholic Church was such a body, and was consequently recognized and protected as a corporation by our courts (p. 47).

He also regards it in the United States as having a missionary basis, and keeping the management of its affairs largely in foreign hands (p. 354). A parish was an agency of the whole church, not to be managed by its inhabitants, but by some distant ecclesiastical authority. "Consequently", he continues, "the property of Catholic churches is universally vested in some church dignitary, either in his personal capacity, or as a corporation sole". Here the author is in error. Statutes are not uncommon, of late years, vesting the title to the church buildings in a small corporation of which the bishop of the diocese is the head, supported by his vicar-general and the parish priest, but of which two lay members of the parish are also members.

From the implied powers of a church corporation the author, on the strength of an Illinois decision (p. 107), excludes that of erecting a business building adjoining or containing a church auditorium. This doctrine since he wrote has been reversed by a later decision.

Mr. Zollmann approves the views of the British courts in the "Wee Free Church" cases (p. 157), though he does not cite them, to the effect that a trust may be implied from usage in gifts to an ecclesiastical authority for the promotion of religion in a certain doctrinal form. He favors, however, those decisions which make for a slow and cautious policy in the creation of such limitations (p. 171).

The case most often quoted in discussions of American church law is that of *Watson v. Jones* (13 Wallace 679). Here the court held that civil courts must accept on doctrinal points the decision of the highest church judicatory, if there were one, as conclusive (pp. 199-235). Mr. Zollmann regards this as un-American, and founded on a misconception of the obligations of a member of any particular church. If he is to be bound to any doctrine, it is because he has virtually agreed to it. That the principle of *Watson v. Jones* has not been without strong judicial support he admits as well as deplors, but; he says, that case "occupies about the same position toward the other cases on the subject as the initial prevarication in a typical farce occupies toward the lies invented to cover it" (p. 222).

A good account is given of the Annetje Jans attack on the title of Trinity Church to its immense landed property in New York City, as an illustration of the right of a religious body to claim the defense of prescription and adverse possession (pp. 398-403).

The distinction between the territorial right to a pew in one of the established churches in England, and the contractual right of an American pewholder, is well explained (pp. 414, 426).

The concluding chapter is devoted to questions arising under the deeds of trust of Methodist Episcopal churches (pp. 444-450). Few



legal papers have occasioned more litigation than the "Methodist Episcopal deed", originally put in form by John Wesley. It is an interesting combination of provisions, some of which look to the welfare of the particular church, and part to that of the entire denomination.

SIMEON E. BALDWIN.

*Canadian Confederation and its Leaders.* By M. O. HAMMOND. (New York: George H. Doran Company. 1917. Pp. x, 333. \$2.50.)

*The Federation of Canada, 1867-1917.* Four lectures delivered in the University of Toronto in March, 1917, to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Federation. By GEORGE M. WRONG, Sir JOHN WILLISON, Z. A. LASH, R. A. FALCONER. (Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1917. Pp. viii, 144. 3 sh.)

*The Constitution of Canada in its History and Practical Working.* By WILLIAM RENWICK RIDDELL, LL.D., Justice of the Supreme Court of Ontario. [Yale Lectures on the Responsibilities of Citizenship.] (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1917. Pp. 170. \$1.25.)

On July 1, 1917, Canada celebrated the completion of its fiftieth year as a federal state. The anniversary happened to come in the midst of a great war, when public attention was concentrated on an urgent present, but there was widespread newspaper comment on the development of half-a-century and one or two volumes of permanent interest have been published. In 1917 Canada was as old as was the United States in 1839. There is, however, a great difference in population. Roughly speaking Canada is just a hundred years behind the United States in population. It had in 1917 about as many people as the United States in 1817. It will be interesting to see whether Canada tends to "catch up" on the United States or whether the same disparity is preserved. It is likely that between 1917 and 1967 Canada will grow more rapidly than the United States grew between 1819 and 1869, for railways and steamships make the migration of population easier now than it was a hundred years ago. If only the old ratio is maintained Canada will have in 1967 about eighteen million people.

Mr. Hammond's *Confederation and its Leaders* is based chiefly on printed biographies. The English is often careless and there is no evidence of special political insight. Short biographical sketches in a journalistic style are given of seventeen men, some of whom, like Joseph Howe in Nova Scotia, and Mr. A. A. Dorion in Lower Canada, strongly opposed the federation of Canada. In glancing at these leaders one thinks inevitably of the men who shaped in 1787 the Constitution of the United States and wonders whether the Canadian leaders measured up to the standard of their prototypes. The Canadians had the easier task, for they were preserving old traditions and not setting up a government,

the fruit of revolution, and they had before them the record for three quarters of a century of the great federal state, their neighbor. The Canadian federation was outlined in 1864 at the very time when Sherman was making his desolating march from Atlanta to the sea and when federalism was acutely on trial. Of the seventeen men sketched by Mr. Hammond nine are lawyers and three journalists. In sagacity Sir John Macdonald is fitted to rank with Benjamin Franklin, in financial insight Sir Alexander Galt, son of the famous Scottish novelist, John Galt, was perhaps the equal of Alexander Hamilton, though he lacked his powers of exposition, and as a writer George Brown was the equal of Madison. It was able men who shaped the Canadian federation and their work has endured. Even to-day, when the strain of war has placed French-speaking Quebec in a position of antagonism to the rest of Canada, no one talks seriously of secession. The federation, like that of the United States, is permanent and spreads from sea to sea.

The little volume *The Federation of Canada* consists of four lectures delivered in the University of Toronto to celebrate Canada's fiftieth anniversary. The history of the federation movement is given by Professor George M. Wrong, in the Creation of the Federal System in Canada. Sir John Willison, a well-known Canadian journalist, writes in a vivid style on the political leaders in the movement, most of whom he knew personally, and Sir Robert Falconer, president of the University of Toronto, discusses with insight the Quality of Canadian Life, and pays no florid compliments to his own people. Not the most interesting of the lectures, but the one most suggestive to the student of political institutions, is that by Mr. Z. A. Lash on the Working of Federal Institutions in Canada. Mr. Lash is a Canadian lawyer of wide experience. He contrasts the Canadian system with that of the United States and shows that the federal power in Canada has authority to regulate transportation and is not confined to inter-state traffic. It has complete jurisdiction with respect to the criminal law, to divorce, and to executive pardon. It can disallow provincial acts that are *ultra vires* without the intervention of any court and it can, of right, give jurisdiction to a provincial court and judges and require from them the service named. It appoints all judges federal or provincial, and so on. The result is that there are few disputes in Canada about jurisdiction. Altogether the book contains a very lucid account of the origin and working of the Canadian system.

The volume on *The Constitution of Canada in its History and Practical Working* by Mr. Justice Riddell, of the Supreme Court of the Province of Ontario, consists of four lectures in the useful Yale series of lectures on the responsibilities of citizenship. He discusses in successive lectures the history of constitutional development in Canada, the specific terms of the British North America Act which is the written constitution, the working of this constitution with special reference to Canada's relations to Great Britain, and lastly compares the federal sys-

tem of Canada with that of the United States. He appends to each chapter copious references to authorities and supplementary comments on his text. He is not always accurate. Wolfe did not take Quebec (p. 8). It is not true that the Canadian French made "no complaint" about the use of the English criminal law (p. 9). The seigneurs in particular objected to trial by a jury of peasants as degrading. The new constitution of Canada in 1841 did not grant "responsible government" (p. 24). This came a few years later, not under the clauses of a statute but by the full adoption of the unwritten law of the British constitution by which the cabinet system exists. So well informed a writer should not speak of the Earl of Derby as Earl Derby (p. 103). He is too fond of sententious contrasts. It is not true that "in the United States the Courts are supreme; in Canada the people through their representatives" (p. 145). He seems to forget that the Imperial Privy Council, a court not created by the Canadian people, has the last word in interpreting their constitution, while the people of the United States, if they so wished, could sweep away the Supreme Court by a constitutional amendment.

The danger in Mr. Justice Riddell's writing is that he sets out with a thesis to prove that Canada is a more democratic country than the United States. He shows rightly enough that, within the frontiers of Canada, its Parliament is supreme but is apparently content that Great Britain should manage the foreign affairs of Canada, something that many of his countrymen will not endure much longer. The analogy of position is, as he says, not between the President and the king but between the President and the prime minister. He thinks the President a very despotic person, and so he is, but does Mr. Justice Riddell realize that greater concentration of authority in Canada which gives the prime minister control of the second chamber, since he nominates to all vacancies, of the whole executive government, of the legislative power in the popular chamber, and even of the naming of the governor-general since he is always consulted about this appointment? True, the House of Commons can dismiss the prime minister at any time but, in fact, for fifty years, it has done so only once and in Canada, as in the United States, the head of the government is changed by a vote of the people and, unlike a President, a Canadian prime minister may retain office indefinitely. Sir Oliver Mowat was prime minister of Ontario for twenty-four years continuously. As Mr. Justice Riddell says rightly the Canadian party system has greater rigor than that of the United States with the result of a greater permanency of office-holding in Canada.

Mr. Justice Riddell's book is stimulating and original and, even if one-sided, is a valuable contribution to the literature of the Canadian constitution. Canadian scholars have not written enough upon the very interesting institutions of Canada. It is pleasant to find a busy judge writing a popular treatise upon the laws which he is interpreting from the bench.

BOOKS ON THE FAR EAST

*The Early Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Japan, 1853-1865.* By PAYSON JACKSON TREAT, Ph.D., Professor of Far Eastern History in Stanford University. [Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History, 1917.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1917. Pp. ix, 459. \$2.50.)

It is easy to discount the success of American diplomacy in opening Japan as the outcome of fortuitous circumstances. We occupied a unique position, as Professor Nitobé pointed out long ago, and no European government could have played the rôle we undertook in sending Commodore Perry to Yedo Bay with as good a chance as ours of persuading the *Bakufu* to reverse its ancient policy of non-intercourse. It is easy, on the other hand, to belittle the issue as an instance of extraordinary luck in diplomacy and to ignore the important elements of preparation and selection of agents in carrying out the plan. The story makes pleasant reading in the brief annals of American diplomacy, and it has never been so well set forth as in Professor Treat's study of the documents in the case. His book, while eminently readable, is properly a treatise for historical students rather than for general readers. It covers the work of Perry, Harris, and Pruyn during a period when the delicate business of groping their way through the haze of Japanese politics was entrusted to men in whom Americans have reason to take much pride.

The author is content to leave the account of Harris's hard-earned success in wringing a commercial treaty from the Japanese to Dr. Griffis's well-known biography. He contributes rather more to the legation days in Yedo and Harris's experience with his confrères. American policy involved co-operation with Europeans as well as moderation toward the Japanese. It was not easy to carry out this programme. That the Shogun's government was in a dilemma, was revealed through gossip picked up by interpreters and by a dreadful series of assassinations by *ronins*—detached henchmen of the nobility; the officials, then as ever, were taciturn and unwilling or afraid to explain the political situation to the foreigners. After the seventh murder in the foreign community the plenipotentiaries, with the exception of Harris, withdrew from Yedo to Yokohama, on the ground that the government had determined to remove foreigners from the country by intimidation and murder. Our minister, guided by a finer instinct where all were in the dark, held his place in the capital, and the event abundantly justified his determination. He seems to have been brought to this decision by the sound reflection that a sympathetic policy toward an administration sore distraught would serve his own government best in assisting that of Japan. It is noteworthy in passing that his reasoning in those trying days appears to have resembled that of our State Department in its recent agreement with the Japanese: they may be capable of unfathomable duplicity, but

their statesmen have a sense of chivalry which responds to a straightforward appeal; one is safer in reposing confidence in this than in promises or threats. Harris was not only right in his estimate of the character of the Shogun's advisers, but he argued correctly that it was a tactical blunder to endanger by a sudden flight the exercise of a minister's right of residence at the capital, for which he had contended during two years.

Yet it is curious to observe that the most charitable critic of his time called it a grave error to assume Japanese civilization to be on a par with that of the Western world. "The Japanese [he declares] are not a civilized, but a semi-civilized people, and the condition of affairs in this country is quite analogous to that of Europe during the middle ages." It is possible that the Western world has altered its terms in sixty years and is not as prone now as then to assume fixed standards for "civilization".

F. W. WILLIAMS.

*Japan Day by Day—1877, 1878-79, 1882-83.* By EDWARD S. MORSE.

In two volumes. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1917. Pp. 450; 426. \$8.00.)

THESE volumes are in my eyes history—although not a history. The historian can no more ignore Morse's *Japan* than he can Dr. Johnson's *Tour to the Hebrides*, Pepys's *Diary*, or Marco Polo's frequently misleading but always valuable *Journey to the Kathay of Kublai Khan*. Morse's first visit to Nippon was almost coincident with my own; and it is a pleasure for me to bear witness to the rare combination of scientific training, physical endurance, contagious good humor, and finally of opportunities offered by official rank in the learned world of Tokyo—all these united to make a diary crowded with incidents and observations, the more precious for being impressions recorded before the novelty had worn off. The author will soon celebrate his eightieth birthday—although only the calendar taxes him with age!—and we are grateful that these volumes have so long lain dormant. A younger traveller might have been less wise or less modest and sought to perfect the style or suppress some impressions which afterwards had to be corrected. For instance, he is present at a fire in the capital and laughs derisively at the antics of the fire brigade—because he does not understand their object. We think the hose is meant to squirt water on the house; the Japanese firemen of 1877 used the hose to saturate only the men who risked their lives in demolishing such inflammable buildings as lay to leeward of the conflagration. In general, however, Professor Morse had from the outset a body-guard of loving and admiring students who initiated him into every domestic, religious, and political arcanum and who consequently saved him from the endless pitfalls into which the mere globe-trotter stumbles, wallows, and emerges—with a book. We are spared the latter-day nonsense so sedulously spread by our California friends that "all

Japanese are dishonest"! On this matter Morse remarks (I. 38) "I am informed that some stealing takes place when the people have been associated for some time with the so-called civilized races; but in the interior dishonesty is seldom known and, indeed, is of rare occurrence in treaty ports."

Morse cannot be classified—unless under many heads: zoology, archaeology, astronomy, palaeontology, philology, toxology—yet to-day he is best known in Boston as an authority in Japanese art and architecture. I have read these two volumes through, page by page, and have placed them on my shelf of books to be read again. These lines attempt to give the student some notion of his work. Yet I find that my pen draws me to rhapsody rather than to critical review. Not a chapter that does not tempt one to quote largely. How define Morse's book? As well summarize the wares at a world's fair or the paintings of the Louvre. The student of history will find in every chapter light that will help him to understand the trend of Japanese endeavor to-day—and every line readable. To conclude as I began—the work is not a history, yet the subtle wit of Gibbon, the charming garrulity of Herodotus, the philosophic calm of Hume, the gay worldliness of Voltaire, the searching satire of Macaulay—the student will feel the vibration of these great historians of the past in the sympathetic pages of Morse's *Japan Day by Day*.

POULTNEY BIGELOW.

#### MINOR NOTICES

*Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1915.* (Washington, 1917, pp. 375.) This volume of the *Annual Reports* contains a greater proportion of formal matter than many of its predecessors, because of the unusual amount of business which had to be transacted in the thirty-first annual meeting of the society. Some eighty pages, too, are occupied by reports on the archives of the states of California and Vermont, made for the Public Archives Commission, the former by Edward L. Head, archivist at Sacramento, the latter by Dr. A. H. Shearer. There are, however, some notable contributions of historical narrative or exposition, such as Professor W. S. Ferguson's paper on Economic Causes of International Rivalries and Wars in Ancient Times; a learned account of East German Colonization in the Middle Ages, by Professor J. W. Thompson; Miss Davenport's paper on America and European Diplomacy, to 1648; that of Professor Moses on the Social Revolution of the Eighteenth Century in South America; that of Dr. R. H. Lutz on Rudolph Schleiden and his Visit to Richmond, April 25, 1861, and two papers on Nationalism, by Professors Edward Krehbiel and W. T. Laprade.

*An Historical Introduction to Social Economy.* By F. Stuart Chapin, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Sociology and Economics in Smith Col-



lege. (New York, Century Company, 1917, pp. xi, 316, \$2.00.) This series of essays based upon standard authorities brings into contrast the types of industrial society of Greece, of Rome, and of England at the close of the medieval period, with the important objective of the subsequent industrial revolution. It is a book of historical pictures and historical judgments rather than a detailed history of industrial society. Necessarily in so brief a survey only the main historical movements could be presented. While as an historical summary it is valuable especially as an introduction to social and industrial history, its main purpose is to show the effect of different industrial methods on the welfare of the laborer, and the attempt to relieve poverty caused by defective industrial systems. However, in discussing the main phases of the land question as a basis of social organization, the changes from slavery to free labor, the characteristics of handcraft and domestic systems, and finally the condition of labor under the system of power manufacture, sufficient historical discussion is given to indicate continuity of cause and effect.

Emphasis on the vital importance of the industrial revolution and its extension into the recent transformation of society by the introduction of power manufacture, on the extended use of inventions and discovery, and on the increased social organization arising therefrom, is the distinguishing characteristic of the book. Indeed, the Greek, Roman, and medieval conditions of the laborer have few lessons to teach us regarding the social problems arising in these latter days of the industrial revolution which has not yet reached its zenith. A general deduction by the comparison of industrial methods of different nations is the universal attempt of the industrially strong to exploit the industrially weak. While this has been a characteristic of all systems, the last three years are presaging greater changes through industrial revolution than have occurred in the previous fifty, so far as the reorganization of society is concerned. The industrial revolution has become a social mutation. History is being made rapidly but can in no way be made to repeat itself except in spirit. Modern social problems cannot be solved by any precedents or examples set by nations whose institutions have become obsolete. The best equipment for the solution of modern problems is a thorough persistent research into present conditions. Nevertheless, an historical survey of what other nations have failed to accomplish may clarify our minds for the task. For this purpose, Mr. Chapin's delightful and instructive book is valuable as an introduction to social economy. Its historical vision is clear, its statements accurate, and it is sufficiently comprehensive for the author's purpose.

FRANK WILSON BLACKMAR.

*An Inquiry into the Nature of Peace and the Terms of Its Perpetuation.* By Thorstein Veblen. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1917, pp. xiii, 367, \$2.00.) As its title indicates the book in hand deals



rather with matters of politics and social theory than with history. Its argument, written in the author's characteristic style, is suggestive, and in some particulars highly important.

His use of history, though limited, is of more than ordinary interest, because he reverses some of the generally accepted points of view.

Take, for instance, "Chinafication", which is commonly accepted as an obvious evidence of degradation, unfitness, and general inferiority, for which not a word can be said. Mr. Veblen suggests that "Chinafication" is not without its advantages. History shows that, despite many foreign dynasties, the Chinese have managed to hold their territory, and have made imposing contributions to civilization. The Armenians, too, have long been a subject people, exposed to massacre and every evil of oppression, but they have persisted. This history, says Veblen, "teaches that the Chinese plan of non-resistance has proved eminently successful . . . that a diligent attention to the growing of crops and children is the sure and appointed way to the maintenance of a people and its culture". He does not follow this by the speculation it suggests as to the relation of force and moral principles to social progress and the persistence of peoples and their civilizations. This is, however, involved in his reflections on the social customs and conceptions of a people and their persistence. Such customs and conceptions Mr. Veblen, as might be expected, regards as acquired characteristics, or "second nature". If, then, they come from environment, they may also change with environment, and the possibility of change depends on the ability to change the environment.

Applying this to the present problem of Germany, Mr. Veblen contends that the Teutonic peoples have never had a democratic environment. He rejects the free agricultural community of the early Teutons as an "academic legend", and contends that as a people they have always had the habit of subjection. The possibility of their living amicably with their democratic neighbors depends on the rapidity with which they can unlearn their highly-wrought and age-long servility, loyalty, and national animosity. Mr. Veblen thinks this is bound to take long, hints that it may take about as long to unlearn as it took to learn, and holds that in any case it will hardly come without the passing of a generation or by grace of some comprehensive discipline of experience.

The French and Anglo-Saxon peoples have long since left behind the institutional phases in which the Germans still live. In this connection there is a startling inversion of commonly accepted views. Regarding Teutonic influence as undemocratic, as has been noted, Mr. Veblen declares that the French are farther advanced because of their retention out of Roman times of the conception of a commonwealth.

That the English and French of to-day have a much more advanced conception of individual liberty and self-government than the Germans does not prove or even argue that the Roman influence was wholesome and the Teutonic injurious. After all, the English, at least so our his-

tories have taught so far, have been more influenced by Teutonic than by Roman conceptions, and they are certainly about as democratic as the French. It is not necessary to do violence to the hitherto accepted opinions as to the influence of Teutonic and Roman institutions to explain the differences between Germans and others. There is plenty of ground for this in the environment of the respective peoples during the last seven centuries.

EDWARD KREHBIEL.

*The Law and the State: French and German Doctrines.* By Léon Duguit, Professor in the Faculty of Law of Bordeaux; translated by Frederick J. de Sloovere, Instructor in Law in the Catholic University of America. [*Harvard Law Review*, November, 1917, vol. XXXI., no. 1, special number.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1917, pp. 192, 35 cents.) To the historian, except as he is interested in tracing the development of political theories, this work is of no direct value. To the political philosopher it is of considerable interest. It not only serves to set in clearer outline than has previously been presented in English the characteristic doctrines of the author, but furnishes an excellent analysis of the theories of Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, Seydel, and Jellinek, not to mention other less important political theorists. Duguit's central objection to the systems of all these writers is the predication of omnipotence to the state. Objection to granting the existence of this state attribute is, one might say, an *idée fixe* with him, and necessitates a denial by him of the personality and sovereignty of the state. And yet, acute thinker as he is, it seems that he is often led astray in his criticisms, as well as in the construction of his own system, by a failure to distinguish between sovereignty and state omnipotence as a juristic premise upon which to erect systems of public law and determine questions of mere legality, and the ascription to the state of either material power or ethical right to do whatsoever those in control of its government may see fit to demand. This error pervades the whole essay, but a single instance will suffice to show its presence. If, he says, on page 21, we concede a supreme will to the state we must then maintain "that there cannot exist between two or more sovereign states any relation of right, any reciprocal obligation of a legal character; that violence and force are the only laws of international relations. We know with what impudence this proposition was affirmed at the very beginning of the war by the representatives of Germany". M. Duguit does indeed show in a very convincing manner how the theories of Kant and Hegel made it possible for German publicists to develop a political philosophy which exalts the sovereign state as a mystical and essentially divine entity raised above the plane of the moral obligations that bind mere men, and especially he shows how the will of a king could come to be held as the will of the state he rules, but Duguit is certainly in error when, in the purely juristic theories of Seydel, Ihering, and Jellinek, he finds neces-

sary and logical support for the atrocious *Realpolitik* of modern Germany.

W. W. WILLOUGHBY.

*Dio's Roman History.* With an English Translation by Earnest Cary, Ph.D., on the Basis of the Version of Herbert Baldwin Foster, Ph.D. In nine volumes. Volumes V. and VI. [Loeb Classical Library.] (London, William Heinemann; New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1917, pp. 526, 492, \$1.50 each.) These are volumes of Dio's *Roman History* as published in the now familiar dress of the *Loeb Library*, a format that has on the whole approved itself to the scholarly world. Two earlier volumes of Dio have been noticed in preceding numbers of the *Review*. The present volumes contain books XLVI. to LV. inclusive, covering the stirring years 43 to 31 B. C., from shortly after the death of Julius Caesar to the decisive battle of Actium, and most of the years of the rule of Augustus, to 8 A. D.

The final translation comes from Dr. Earnest Cary, but the work is essentially based upon the version published in 1905 by the late Professor Herbert B. Foster of Lehigh University, a translation which did much credit to American classical scholarship, which did not, however, bring its author all the prompt recognition which his effort undoubtedly deserved. Previous to that time it had been impossible to read Dio in English, despite the existence of good French and German translations.

Dio's place as an historian has long been established. He did not write in very smooth Greek, he was prolix, he was often dull, he was still more frequently uncritical, and he was sometimes grossly credulous. But the fact remains that he had a good grasp on the essentials of Roman history, that he understood the methods of imperial administration, that he had access to official documents, that he strove to tell the truth without silly rhetoric, and that he prepared a voluminous history which (so far as it is preserved to us) is an invaluable compendium of information, especially for the whole imperial period down to about 220 A. D. It is a grievous misfortune that so much of this truly monumental work is transmitted merely through the jejune compendium of Zonaras and the epitome of the monk Xiphilinus. In republishing the surviving books of Dio, therefore, the *Loeb Library* has rendered a service to all friends of the humanities.

WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS.

*A Note-book of Mediaeval History, A. D. 323-A. D. 1453.* By C. Raymond Beazley, Professor of Modern History in the University of Birmingham. (Oxford and New York, Clarendon Press, 1917, pp. viii, 224, \$1.20.) It is perhaps Professor Beazley's notes for his own class-room lectures which are thus given permanent form and shared with his fellow teachers. At any rate, it is a very live and stimulating body of materials and suggestions for such lectures—arranged, as he

himself tells us, according to order of time and without division by countries, but broken up into comparatively short periods (less than half a century for the most part) and rich in data for the history of culture and civilization as well as for that of politics. As one might expect from the historian of medieval geography, the book is especially notable for the breadth of its vision and for the wealth of exact and often curious information as to outlying lands and movements. Especially eastern Europe and the Orient come in for generous memory. The matter is at times a little chaotic, and there are many marks of haste—as where (p. 19) early Alsace is vexatiously called “Alsace-Lorraine”. But, such as it is, both teacher and student will find it a mine of fascinating information and inference. It should be widely accessible.

*Tort, Crime, and Police in Mediaeval Britain: a Review of some Early Law and Custom.* By J. W. Jeudwine, LL.B. Camb. (London, Williams and Norgate, 1917, pp. xix, 292, 6 sh.) This can hardly be regarded as either an authoritative or an enlightening work on the subject. It is a not too well arranged collection of extracts from the ancient laws of Great Britain, with little legal and much modernist political comment. The author, though his treatise is too short to cover his subject even if he confined himself to England alone, employs a large part of it in wanderings far afield. Of his six references to Pollock and Maitland's standard history, not one contains a discussion of a point of tort, crime, or police; nor does either of his two references to Stephen's *History*. Out of twenty-five references to the Year Books, only two seem apposite to the subject of the treatise. A few authorities quite in point are drawn from the Selden Society *Publications*, more from the Brehon and Welsh laws, and a number from the Mosaic law—apparently on the ground, stated by the author without an attempt at proof, that the common law was largely influenced by the law of Moses. The pages devoted to tort and crime throw little light on the law or its administration.

The long Supplement is frankly unconcerned with law, but contains the author's meditations on modern conditions, suggested, to be sure, by something he has found in the medieval law. The author's views are strong and vigorous, and often shrewd. He attacks the system of imprisonment for small crimes, especially for drunkenness; he reviles the English system of magistrates' courts; he expresses a strong preference for the Brehon laws, and pays his respects to the Ulsterman. One who seeks this discussion of medieval crime for its racy presentation of a few modern problems will not be disappointed in what he finds; the historian of law will hardly treasure the book.

JOSEPH H. BEALE.

*Registres Perdus des Archives de la Chambre des Comptes de Paris.*  
Par Ch.-V. Langlois. [From Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de

la Bibliothèque Nationale et Autres Bibliothèques, tome XL.] (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1916, pp. 366, 14 fr.) The archives of the chamber of accounts of Paris were destroyed by fire in 1737. With the possible exception of a few odd volumes, only the records of the section called the *dépôt des fiefs* were saved, and by far the larger and more valuable portion of the most extensive archives in France was burned. It is with the series of registers lost at this time that Professor Langlois deals. He describes the sources of information, establishes correct lists of the principal series of registers, explains the general nature of their contents, and indicates for each series of registers the inventories and collections of extracts which have been preserved. A few volumes of especial importance or of exceptional nature, such as the register *Bel*, he treats in greater detail, and he devotes one chapter to a study of the relations between the archives of the chamber and the *trésor des chartes*. The treatise provides the first clear and systematic guide for the study of a series of documents which have not yet been utilized by historians to an extent commensurate with their importance. It should become the starting-point of any subsequent researches in the records of the chamber.

Professor Langlois concludes his volume with two long appendixes. The first contains extracts from a transcript of the second journal of the chamber, begun in 1321. The journal contained memoranda of business transacted by the chamber. The second is a reconstruction of the Red Book in the form of a calendar. The register preserved copies of royal letters dating from the last years of the thirteenth century to about 1322, with a few additions as late as 1336. The register was among the oldest compiled by the clerks of the chamber. It has been classed among the *Libri Memoriales*, but the editor thinks it more closely allied to the series of registers called *chartes*. The documents are largely records of royal gifts and grants similar to those found in the first registers in the chronological series of the *trésor des chartes*.

W. E. LUNT.

*Venise dans la Littérature Française depuis les Origines jusqu'à la Mort de Henri IV.* By Béatrix Ravà. (Paris, Édouard Champion, 1916, pp. 612, 14.40 fr.) This book will be of little interest to historians. It is primarily a compendium of references to Venice in French literature from Villehardouin, the partizan contemporary historian of the Fourth Crusade, to Henri Estienne, traveller, printer, and advocate of the pre-eminence of the French language, in the late sixteenth century, while it purports to be an analysis of the influence of Venice upon the literature of France. To be sure, the author disarms the historian in the preface by disclaiming all reference to historians whose works are not recommended by their artistic worth whatever their scientific value; and the chapters devoted to the historical background, on the political relations between Venice and France in the Middle Ages, from the Fourth Cru-

sade to Louis XI., from Charles VIII. to Henri IV., are of no pretense and of less worth.

The first part of the book, devoted to the literary manifestations of political relations, to the French travellers, pilgrims, and poets in Venetia in the Middle Ages, savors of the seminar and the card catalogue, devoid of the critical attitude desirable in one if not in the other. The second part follows the same plan for the Renaissance with a chapter on Venetian printers and their influence in France, but is written on the whole with more spirit. If one agrees with the conclusion of the author (p. 489) that Venetian "vertus littéraires sont comme les perles de cette mer, dont elle est la reine: elles ne paraissent pas à la surface; elles sont cachées dans les profondeurs infinies, et seules des mains habiles peuvent les découvrir et les transformer en bijoux précieux", one can only mourn that the hands were not as able as diligent. The transformation does not appear.

There are forty-three extracts from texts, covering one hundred pages, four of them hitherto unedited. None is of great significance. One wonders how in this day and age a printer could be found so lacking in a sense of economy and of courage, as not to have enforced upon the author some necessary and profitable compression.

*Church and State in the Reign of Louis Philippe, 1830-1848.* By John M. S. Allison. (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1916, pp. 178.) Mr. Allison's monograph aims to set forth certain of the relations of Church and State during the eighteen years of the reign of Louis Philippe. Particularly is it a study of the Liberal Catholic movement associated with the names of Lamennais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and Ozanam. Lamennais's reform ideas are clearly presented, "the regeneration of the Church by liberty and the regeneration of mankind by the Church when once it had been freed from its faults", the revival of a dynamic faith within the Church itself and among the people in a time of spiritual indifference. The evolution of Lamennais's ideas, their attraction for a number of young men of talent, the various methods employed for their diffusion, the opposition aroused in ecclesiastical and political circles, particularly to the idea of the entire independence of the Church and its complete separation from the State, the political implications of the movement both in home and foreign policies, all these are clearly traced, as is also the speedy and decisive condemnation of the movement by the pope, Gregory XVI., in the encyclical *Mirari vos*.

The author then describes the revival in later years of this movement apparently so completely eradicated by the papal allocution, a revival that was slow and also partial. For the later struggle of the Liberal Catholic was more limited than the previous unsuccessful venture, was in fact essentially restricted to the demand for liberty of association and liberty of teaching, held by the Neo-Catholics to be implicit in

the Charter. The outstanding feature of this phase of the movement was the campaign against the monopoly of the University in educational matters, the vicissitudes of which campaign are shown.

In the filling-in of the general political background and history of the reign the author is less satisfactory, less clear, and less sure than in his outline of the religious development proper. He has, in the reviewer's opinion, far too high an opinion of Thureau-Dangin's history of this period, a history, as Gooch says, redolent of the atmosphere of the Faubourg St. Germain and by an author "more conservative than Guizot". In this section of Mr. Allison's book questionable statements are not infrequent, such as that Lamartine inaugurated the Reform Banquets, and that Thiers was a leader of the Republicans as early as 1844 (p. 136), and that he retired from the Guizot ministry in 1845 (p. 157).

The book lacks a table of contents and an index and the typographical errors are numerous.

CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN.

*The House of Hohenzollern and the Hapsburg Monarchy.* Originally published in the *New York Evening Post* and the *New York Nation*. By Gustav Pollak. (New York, New York *Evening Post* Company, 1917, pp. 102, 50 cents; paper 25 cents.) In seven articles, published between December, 1916, and July, 1917, Pollak discusses the bearing of the war on the relations between the Central European allies and its effect on the various nationalities in the Dual Monarchy. All are written in the vigorous style of the seasoned political feuilletonist. Through all runs the thread of bitter dislike of Prussia and its reigning house. The initial accord is struck in the first article with the statements that the Hohenzollerns have done nothing for German literature, except that which glorified Prussian deeds, and have made no concessions to liberty, except through political necessity. The second paper, Bismarck's Neglected Policies, seeks to explain Prussia's diplomatic failures abroad, where Berlin has held to the Iron Chancellor's brutality and selfishness but has forgotten his "nightmare of coalitions". In the next article Pollak reviews Naumann's *Mittleuropa*, which he finds based on the same old creed of coercion and selfishness. Austria's Opportunity, published March 31, 1917, emphasizes the dislike in Vienna and Budapest of Prussia's rulers, whose league with the Dual Monarchy is based on no inner kinship of tradition. The Future of Bohemia throws cold water on Czech aspirations for independence, pointing a warning finger at the dangers to which an independent Bohemia may be exposed. Tisza's fall in May last led the author to stress again the inherent antagonism of Prussian and Austrian; and the last paper gives a résumé of the political progress of the Galician Poles, whose struggle with the Ruthenians since 1908 is briefly sketched.

The little work forms a readable, although very one-sided and superficial, review of Austria's recent relations to her Germanic neighbor, as

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—45.



well as to the Czech, Pole, and Magyar within her gates. Pollak's bitter feeling toward Prussia, and his tenderness of the Hapsburgs, is everywhere in evidence. Once more Grillparzer's obsession of a Prussian conspiracy against Austrian writers is rehearsed (p. 91), although Pollak, in a work written in a day of fairer judgments, doubts this (*Grillparzer and the Austrian Drama*, 1907, p. 32) and cites more plausible reasons for Grillparzer's lack of popularity in North Germany (*ibid.*, p. 330). The tremendous welding of national feeling in Germany during the past forty years is utterly disregarded by the author, who can still quote Bismarck and W. H. Riehl on South German particularism, and the *Grossdeutsche* Gervinus on the annexations of 1866, as if they were representative of present conditions and sentiments. Prussia is anathema! Of the articles on Austro-Hungarian politics, that on Bohemia is informing and admirably judicial in tone. The others, particularly the analysis of the situation in Hungary, show a lack of clear development and coherence. Even the inherently sketchy character of the feuilleton can hardly excuse such a statement as, "Down to the close of the eighteenth century Europe was but little concerned in the destinies of Bohemia" (p. 68) ("What about the great Ottokar, and the Hussite wars, and the Thirty Years' War?" asks the marvelling reader) or that "Prussia lured Austria into the present war" (p. 78).

ROBERT H. FIFE, JR.

*The Battle of the Somme.* By John Buchan. (New York, George H. Doran Company, 1917, pp. x, 264, \$1.50.) The battle of the Somme began in midsummer of the year 1916, and continued until winter put an end to active operations. Like the fighting from the Wilderness to Petersburg in the summer of 1864, the battle of the Somme was remarkable for the number of casualties, an expenditure of effort and life out of proportion to the advantage gained by the English and French. What the battle showed was that the British had learned much about present-day warfare, and that, by assembling sufficient numbers of troops, guns, and munitions on a given front favorable to the operation, limited progress could be made. But the limited advance, which, so far, alone seems possible, takes on something of a tactical advantage to the enemy, because each offensive calls for a complete reconstruction of the territory passed over. The limited advance exhausts itself, and the greater the amount of preparation required for the advance, in men, munitions, and cannon, the shorter is the range of these advances upon limited fronts, unless, as sometimes happens, the immediate retirement is to ground untenable for topographical reasons.

Mr. Buchan's book sets forth in a popular fashion, and, at times, with some diffuseness of incident and description, the preparations for the long contest, and the outcome. But so much water has run through the mill since the battle of the Somme that some of his claims and prog-

nostications, in the light of the present military situation, seem over-confident.

The psychological influence of over-confident declaration has its uses, but if the efforts to create confidence are overdone, the reaction is worse than the first state. General Meade, one of America's most skillful soldiers, wrote in December, 1864, "This passion of believing newspaper and club strategy will I suppose never be eradicated from the American public mind, notwithstanding the experience of four years in which they have from day to day seen its plans and hopes and fears dissipated by facts". In warfare, instead of psychology changing the facts, the facts change the psychology.

ISAAC R. PENNYPACKER.

*The Homely Diary of a Diplomat in the East, 1897-1899.* By Thomas Skelton Harrison, former Diplomatic Agent and Consul-General of the United States to the Khedival Court of Cairo. With a Foreword by Sara Yorke Stevenson, Sc.D., Litt.D., Officier d'Instruction Publique. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917, pp. xxix, 364, \$5.00.) The writer of this diary represented the United States in Cairo from 1897 to 1899. He was a Philadelphia manufacturer, with cultivated tastes, especially in respect to "society", dinners, wines, and race-horses. The record which he kept for his private satisfaction, and which describes with intimate detail his daily doings, is one which it was entirely proper for him to keep, and will furnish much entertainment to those who like to read of the doings of a picturesque society in days when important things were going on in Egypt. But the reader who looks for valuable information concerning the political events of the time and place, to justify publication, will look in vain. Mr. Harrison was not the kind of diplomatic representative who has an important part in such doings, or who learns important facts respecting them.

*Out of their Own Mouths: Utterances of German Rulers, Statesmen, Savants, Publicists, Journalists, Poets, Business Men, Party Leaders, and Soldiers.* (New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1917, pp. xxviii, 255, \$1.00.) This is an excellent piece of work. Done avowedly for purposes of propaganda, it is none the less a painstaking and fair presentation of the wrong side of modern Germany. The editor, who has chosen to preserve his anonymity, has taken the French *Jugés par Eux-mêmes* as his model and has used many passages from that collection. He has depended also upon Grumbach's collection. And he has added much from his own wide reading in German political literature, passages to be found in no similar collection. One wishes that out of his abundant knowledge he had ventured more notes upon the men whose words he uses. His arrangement of utterances by ministers, philosophers, historians, publicists, poets, etc., has an advantage. It shows the reader

how widespread were the German conceptions. On the other hand there is no progress. One closes the book a bit confused by miscellaneous passages.

Mistakes are trivial. The editor has given a few references at second hand without verification, else he would not have assigned (pp. 35-40) the wrong pagings to Lasson's *Das Culturideal und der Krieg*, pagings which belong not to the edition of 1868 but to the recent edition which the French quote. Some of the speeches attributed to William II. (pp. 3-5), which the editor takes from *Jugés par Eux-mêmes*, would, I suspect, be hard to find in German newspapers. Has the "Song of the German Sword" been sufficiently authenticated to use? The title of Tannenberg's book is slightly wrong (p. 79).

The introduction, by another hand, is not written with that moderation, which, were there no other reason for it, would serve to lead along the man, unconvinced of Germany's nefarious purposes, to further reading of the book. It is a pity there is no index.

WALLACE NOTESTEIN.

*A History of the Great War.* By Arthur Conan Doyle. Volumes I., II. *The British Campaign in France and Flanders, 1914, 1915.* (New York, George H. Doran Company, 1916, 1917, pp. xiii, 349; ix, 257, \$4.00.) As Sir Arthur Conan Doyle well recognizes, it is too soon for "points of larger strategy" of the Great War to be considered and evaluated, but though the student of European politics and history and the military expert will find little of special value in these volumes there is doubtless a place for such a narrative, built up from letters, diaries, and personal interviews, often with the help of the principal actors in the events narrated. The general reader, who wishes a coherent account of the Great War, an account which shall not make large demands on his previous knowledge and which is written in easy, readable style, will find it here. It must be borne in mind, however, that the emphasis is definitely and intentionally on English action and English achievement, for, despite his title, the author is making no attempt to trace the history of the war as a whole. The eastern front is ignored throughout the two volumes. Nor will the most casual reader fail to perceive that the warmth of the adjectives employed is that of an ardent Englishman, not of an impartial historian.

The first volume opens with a slight sketch of the Breaking of the Peace (30 pp.) which indicates briefly the feeling between Germany and England from 1902 till the outbreak of the war. This is followed by an account of the English preparations once war was declared, and by chapters on the battles of Mons, Le Cateau, the Marne, the Aisne, and Ypres, and the La Bassée-Armentières operations. The volume closes with a few words on Italy's entrance into the war, on the fall of the German colonies, and on sea affairs, and a slightly more extended account of the Winter Lull of 1914.

The second year of the war, which the author characterizes as the year "of equilibrium" in distinction from the first "year of defense", and the third "year of attack", is treated in volume II. Here the same plan is followed as in that of the first volume, the movements of the British army are traced through the battles of Neuve Chapelle, the second battle of Ypres, the battles of Richebourg and Loos.

A third volume is promised which is to carry the account through the year 1916. Both these volumes are supplied with maps and diagrams illustrating the text.

*History of the World War.* By Frank H. Simonds. Volume I. *The Attack on France.* (Garden City and New York, Doubleday, Page and Company, 1917, pp. xxiii, 289, \$3.50.) Mr. Simonds aims to present to the American public an impartial narrative of the World War. As far as the first volume is concerned, he has succeeded admirably. His book, without references, free from technical terminology, and copiously illustrated, is essentially a popular work. But it is more. Because of the author's ability to grasp the essential factors in the struggle, because he writes as an eye-witness of some of its most significant incidents, and because of his close association with the French and British staffs, his account is a valuable contribution to the military history of the war.

The three opening chapters contain a luminous sketch of the antecedents of the war from 1871 to 1914. The diplomacy of the last "twelve days", Simonds believes, was absolutely futile, for it aimed at a compromise when nothing could have brought about peace save an absolute surrender by one of the two hostile groups of Continental powers, and these nations had already decided to fight rather than surrender. He sharply censures the leaders of the English Liberals, including Sir Edward Grey, for not recognizing the realities of the situation during the preceding decade, or even during the last crisis, and for lulling England to a state of false security from which the invasion of Belgium rudely awakened her.

The remainder of the book treats the military operations in Europe from August, 1914, to May, 1915; the war at sea he reserves for another volume. For Mr. Simonds, this whole period forms one distinct phase of the war—the German attack on France. Such a view gives unity and clarity to the narrative. It subordinates the Eastern to the Western theatre of operations, and justly so, for the offensive lay with the Central Powers, and their first objective was the elimination of France. This aim, he shows, was not definitely abandoned for an offensive against Russia until after the second battle of Ypres in April, 1915. The Russian offensive of 1914 was part of the Allies' scheme to parry the German thrust on France.

In some particulars, although claiming to voice the best French and British opinion, Simonds disagrees with such recent works as Madelin's *Victory of the Marne* and Major Whitton's *Marne Campaign*. He holds

that the Marne was really won by Foch's thrust at La Fère-Champenoise, while these still regard Manoury's attack on von Kluck as the decisive factor. Further, Whitton disagrees with Simonds's view that Sir John French's failure to rise to his opportunity alone saved von Kluck from annihilation. Both Madelin and Whitton believe, against Simonds, that the Eastern situation necessitated the transfer of German troops from the West before the battle of the Marne began. Evidently, the final word on these points has yet to be spoken.

To many it will be news that Churchill's "grotesque venture" at Antwerp delayed the proposed evacuation of that city until the Belgian army only escaped in too disorganized a condition to hold the line of the Scheldt, and, therefore, had to surrender the Belgian coast to the Germans.

A final word of commendation is due for the number of useful military maps.

A. E. R. BOAK.

*Topography and Strategy in the War.* By Douglas Wilson Johnson, Associate Professor of Physiography in Columbia University. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1917, pp. x, 211, \$1.75.) Since the beginning of the European war, Professor Johnson has been a close student of the effect of topography upon military movements on the various battle-fronts. No other American geographer has watched these movements so closely. In his preface, he says that he was particularly anxious to discover how far military operations are still affected by the element of terrain, and he reaches the conclusion that there is ample indication that "the rôle played by land forms in plans of campaign and movements of armies is no less important to-day than in the past".

The most thoroughly worked-out portion of the book deals with the western battle-front. The author shows in detail how the four escarpments with their steep slopes toward the Germans and their gentle slopes toward the Paris basin have aided the French in checking the German armies in eastern France. In the northern plain, where no topographic barriers exist, the Germans were able to advance almost to Paris. The author's analysis of the topography about Verdun shows why the repeated attacks of the Germans upon that stronghold have failed.

In the eastern field of operations, the many rivers bordered by swampy banks have been constant barriers offering aid to retreating troops, but obstacles to the pursuers. The Carpathians are shown to have been a most effective barrier in preventing the final success of the great Russian drive which otherwise would have reached the heart of Hungary. On the Italian front the author shows how all of the military advantages arising from the topography lay with the Austrians because they held the main passes and occupied the high ground from which the Italians could dislodge them only by well-nigh superhuman efforts. The final chapters deal with the campaigns in the Balkans.

Professor Johnson is moderate in his claims regarding the influence of topography upon military movements. At times the reader feels that the author is ignoring other factors which are no less significant than topography, but the book does not purport to treat of other factors. It is a clear and illuminating discussion of the subject with which it deals; it is the most valuable contribution in English to the geography of the war and will have permanent value. Eighteen sketch-maps and diagrams and many illustrations add materially to the value of the book.

R. H. WHITBECK.

*Under Four Flags for France.* By George Clarke Musgrave. (New York and London, D. Appleton and Company, 1918, pp. xi, 364, \$2.00.) The author is an experienced war correspondent, and parts of his book rest on personal observation; but not a very large part of it can have that basis, for it endeavors to treat of the whole military history of the war, so far as concerns the achievements of France and her allies on the Western Front. For such endeavors there is an obvious public demand, but it is impossible to meet that demand with anything authoritative at present, and this book, while not without merits, does not so meet it. The style is as ambitious as the plan.

*The Note-Book of an Intelligence Officer.* By Eric Fisher Wood. (New York, Century Company, 1917, pp. xii, 346, \$1.75.) Mr. Wood's study can hardly be called historical in nature, although it may be said to furnish the stuff of which history is made. It is an eye-witness's account of conditions in England in 1917 and a survey of certain characteristics of the fighting on the Western Front just previous to the battle of Arras. It has some of the features of the orthodox accounts of newspaper correspondents and also of the trench literature of combatants, which the present war has made so familiar to us; for Mr. Wood, going to England in the hope of doing something to bring about a better understanding between Americans and the Entente Allies, was given a staff appointment which permitted him to study the mechanism of the British censorship, to come in close contact with several of the leading figures of present-day British politics, to view certain sectors on the British front, and, finally, to take part in the battle of Arras, in which he was wounded.

Major Wood has, evidently, an attractive personality combined with a certain amount of obstinacy, which has enabled him to see at first hand many things in which all Americans are at the present time interested. Most interesting are his chapter on the censorship, the description of the *matériel* of battle, and particularly the impressions of the combatant as he advances in the slow walk which makes the modern military "charge". In his treatment of British notabilities the author is disappointing. The material which he offers on the Prime Minister by no means justifies the title of his chapter, and in his eulogistic discussion of



Lord Northcliffe he forgets to be consistent, citing with evident approval Northcliffe's bitter opposition to the censorship (p. 140), to which Major Wood has already devoted a long chapter, characterized by enthusiastic approval.

CHARLES SEYMOUR.

*Catalogue of Manuscripts in European Languages belonging to the Library of the India Office.* Volume I., *The Mackenzie Collections*; Part I., *The 1822 Collection and the Private Collection*, by C. O. BLAGDEN, M.A. Volume II., Part I. *The Orme Collection*, by S. C. HILL. (London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1916, pp. xxxii, 302; xxxv, 421; 10 sh. 6 d., 12 sh. 6 d.) The British government at Calcutta published in 1828 the two-volume *Descriptive Catalogue* (compiled by H. H. Wilson) of the main part of the Mackenzie Collection of Manuscripts. The present installment deals with two separate parts not represented in the earlier catalogue and "now appears as a separate and advance portion of the volume devoted to the Mackenzie Collections". This division is due to the fact that the present manuscripts were acquired by the government as separate detachments and because for the most part the materials both in the "1822 Collection" and the "Private Collection" relate to Java and the Dutch East Indies. In 1815 Mackenzie became surveyor-general for India; but in the years 1811-1813 he was largely concerned in the English occupation of the Dutch colonies in the east and continued to collect material relating to them till the time of his death in 1821. These manuscripts, therefore, bear a close relation to the Dutch government archives at Batavia, a catalogue of which (1602-1816) was compiled by Van der Chijs in 1822.

The material included is of unequal value, consisting in part of somewhat uncertain English translations of printed Dutch books and also of probably unique confidential reports on the Dutch administration of Java. The controversies as to Governor Daendels figure to a considerable extent, as do also the almost forgotten Dutch interests on the Coromandel coast. Ceylon is also represented. In the main the collection is richest for the period 1780-1815; but both as to time and as to topics there is a wide range. On the whole the catalogue is not a calendar; and the student who does not have access to the manuscripts will not be able to make much indirect use of the collection.

The catalogue of the Orme manuscripts has the advantage of unity. The short introduction by Mr. Hill includes several useful comments on Indian history and explains a few points of importance. Yet here again there is great inequality in the value of the material used. Thus in the second or "India" section of the manuscripts there are many copies of papers also to be found in the first or "Orme Various" section. The contents of a considerable part of the papers has already been exposed in Orme's printed works and in the case of some of the transcripts and translations numerous errors are apparent. Nevertheless, Orme was



the historiographer of the East India Company for a time of immense importance in the history of the British Empire and many of his conclusions have become an almost inseparable element in later literature on the period of which he wrote. In addition there is a considerable body of material for the last third of the eighteenth century on which Orme never wrote. Its positive value is unquestioned and taken in connection with unique papers which fill gaps in official English and French records makes the catalogue a finding list of great importance. The indexes and the careful identification of Oriental names and terms in both books deserve great praise.

A. L. P. D.

*Some Aspects of British Rule in India.* By Sudhindra Bose, Ph.D., Lecturer on Oriental Politics, State University of Iowa. [Bulletin of the State University of Iowa, Studies in the Social Sciences, Vol. V., no. 1.] (Iowa City, University of Iowa, 1916, pp. 149, 80 cts.) The first third of this study is a somewhat unsatisfactory attempt to condense the history of India from the earliest times to the beginning of the present century. Naturally there are errors; and the writer's point of view has led him to declare (p. 31) that "to this day, India is paying dividends to a defunct company", whereas the financial connections of the East India Company ended in 1874. The description of institutions and economic conditions starts with the usual phrases as to the despotism of England in India, passes to inequalities of the judicial system, and concludes with a temperate and searching indictment of English commercial and financial policy. The concluding chapters on the Place of India in the Empire and the Indian Renaissance summarize recent agitation regarding Oriental migration, tariffs, self-government, and nationalism. On the whole the language is temperate and the technique scientific, though the conclusion is overwhelmingly in favor of the Indian, and small attention is paid to any historical, political, or administrative difficulties which may stand in the way.

In general, taken in connection with the abundant references the book is chiefly a digest of contemporary literature, records, platforms, and resolutions directed against British policies in India.

*The Boston Merchants and the Non-Importation Movement.* By Charles M. Andrews. [Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, vol. XIX., pp. 159-259.] (Cambridge, John Wilson and Son, 1917.) This monograph satisfies the high expectations of those students of American history who have become accustomed to looking forward to the appearance of Professor Andrews's studies of the politico-economic aspects of the colonial period. Professor Andrews undertakes the task of explaining the course pursued by the Boston merchants, and incidentally by the colonial merchant class generally, in the period 1763-1770. He writes in the spirit not of George Bancroft

and his school but rather in that of a well-informed contemporary, John Adams, who declared in his later years: "I know not why we should blush to confess that molasses was an essential ingredient in American independence."

Professor Andrews confines his attention very largely to two forms of mercantile activity: the formal petitions which revealed the cause of merchants' difficulties, and the boycott agreements which were their main reliance in seeking redress. To summarize the author's point of view, the purpose of the merchants' activities in these years was to secure remedial trade legislation. With this in mind they undertook the non-importation agreement of 1765 and helped to create the continental system of non-importation in the years 1768-1770. The non-trading public gave them wide support because of the hard times which marked the period. The merchants were in no sense protagonists of popular rights; and they discovered with keen discomfiture in 1770 that, because of their very success in mobilizing public opinion against Parliament, their movement had passed under the control "of political agitators and radicals for the enforcement of constitutional liberty and freedom". The non-importation movement collapsed primarily "because the merchants in New York and elsewhere were satisfied with the partial repeal of the duties, and were unwilling to undergo further losses for the sake of tea and a constitutional claim which had nothing to do with trade".

This interpretation of events is undoubtedly correct. The account might well have been rounded out by a discussion of other phases of merchants' activities during this period, such as the operations of the smugglers and the even more interesting subject of the connection of merchants with the Stamp Act riots. In view of the multiplicity of events it is not surprising that the author should occasionally admit his failure to find documents which a more exacting search would have disclosed. It conveys the wrong impression to say that "Portsmouth remained permanently outside the movement" in view of the resolutions adopted by the town on April 11, 1770, to have no dealings with importers.

Professor Andrews presents new information regarding that *enfant terrible* John Mein and leans to the usual view that Mein's charges against the good faith of the non-importers of Boston had a substantial foundation. To the reviewer it seems that a careful study of the evidence on both sides fails to disclose any material remissness on the part of the merchants. Certainly Hutchinson testified to the success of the merchants' combination, and even that exacting radical, Samuel Adams, could say in a confidential letter: "The Merchants in general have punctually abode by their Agreement, to their very great private loss."

ARTHUR MEIER SCHLESINGER.

*The Dwelling Houses of Charleston, South Carolina.* By Alice R. Huger Smith and D. E. Huger Smith. (Philadelphia and London, J. B.

Lippincott Company, 1917, pp. 387, \$6.00.) Among the many books dealing with colonial houses, the Huger Smiths' volume on those of Charleston is distinguished as a notable contribution to historical knowledge. Contrasting with the usual medley of romance and assumption, it is the first book to establish on documentary grounds the dates of erection of any important series of colonial buildings, and thus the first to give a solid basis for the study of the *development* of our early domestic architecture. For the historian the fundamental value of the book lies in the exhaustive researches of Mr. D. E. Huger Smith in the registry of mesne conveyances, in recorded wills, in court records, and in papers still in private hands. Although he states results with conscientious conservatism, he is enabled to date exactly, or within a brief determinate period of years, every important Charleston house, overturning many vague traditional datings. Beside the record of acquirement and successive ownership of the properties, of the erection, enlargement, and remodelling of the houses, there is much significant architectural analysis, especially regarding the types of plan in their relation to local conditions and climate. Architectural detail is supplied by the admirable photographs taken for the work by Mr. St. Julien Melchers, and by measured drawings by Mr. Albert Simons, including an unusual number of floor and garden plans, as well as unpublished interior details. The ensemble with its atmosphere is well suggested by the many pencil sketches by Miss Alice Huger Smith. Beside all these illustrations there are numerous others from old photographs of buildings now destroyed, and from early engravings and drawings. These include unpublished views by the miniaturist Charles Frazer, whose sketch-book, begun in 1796, Miss Smith hopes later to publish entire.

The material is arranged topographically, in accordance with the growth of the city, and thus preserves a generally chronological order, although subsequent building and the frequency of disastrous fires prevent this from being at all absolute. In general chapters, in a chapter on building materials, and especially in a chapter devoted to the building of Charles Pinckney's house, are given many important documents—official regulations, estimates, contracts, and specifications—bearing on the prices of materials and labor, and on conditions of work.

For tracing the course of architectural development in matters of form and style the book furnishes much material, without itself attempting the task. Certain mooted questions in the history of American architecture are thus settled in its pages, unknown to the authors. For instance in establishing the date of the Miles Brewton house as between 1765 and 1769, they unconsciously determine the earliest example of the superposed portico on this side of the Atlantic. The determination of such questions, however, requires an equipment which can scarcely be expected of local historians, who on their part can, like the authors of this book, do a service which no others can render.

FISKE KIMBALL.

*The Kentucky River Navigation.* By Mary Verhoeff. [Filson Club Publications, no. 28.] (Louisville, Kentucky, John P. Morton and Company, 1917, pp. 257.) In the present volume the author continues her previous study on *The Kentucky Mountains*. As in that work (no. 26 of the *Filson Club Publications*), she emphasizes economic conditions, and in view of the scant material available in her field, she does her work with commendable skill and fullness of detail. Her narrative is clear, concise, and straightforward. She avoids overcrowding it by giving additional explanations and illustrative quotations from the sources in the foot-notes, which the interested reader will find sufficiently numerous and valuable. The citations to authorities are conveniently grouped at the end of each chapter. The illustrations, including some facsimiles of letters, and the maps are numerous, well-arranged, and serviceable. Many of these, as well as many of the conclusions noted in the text, are evidently the result of the author's personal observations and field work. But she has made extensive use of engineering and scientific reports, general government documents, personal memoirs, the narratives of early travellers, the more familiar secondary accounts, and the few valuable monographs that might serve her purpose. Without seeming captious one may note that she could have used contemporary newspapers more extensively, and possibly some other manuscript collections, although this might not have added greatly to the sum total of information in the volume.

An introductory chapter gives the physical setting of the region drained by the Kentucky River. Chapter II. briefly sketches the state and federal improvements that have been attempted along that stream. Chapter III. contains an historical résumé of the beginnings of commerce in Kentucky, with a more favorable view of Wilkinson's relations with the Spaniards than is usually given. Chapter IV. tells how the primitive conditions of transportation were modified by state and national agencies for improving them, but as the two following chapters on Mountain Transportation show, without much substantial result. The author maintains that, by neglecting the rivers when their improvement was a vital matter to the people of eastern Kentucky, the state and national authorities helped to retard the economic progress of the entire region. Thus the railroad rather than the river has been its modern civilizing agency. Traffic on the river has become a matter of progressive elimination, and the most significant problems connected with the stream are those that concern the soil and other detritus that wash into it, the lumber that chokes it, and the water-power that it may furnish to prospective industries. In this local study Miss Verhoeff presents an epitome of an important national problem. In an appendix she fortifies her conclusions by some valuable statistical tables and some interesting extracts from early newspapers and letters. A careful index, both to foot-notes and to the text, completes the work.

*The Diary of a Nation: the War and how we got into it.* By Edward S. Martin. (Garden City and New York, Doubleday, Page and Company, 1917, pp. xii, 407, \$1.50.) The contents of this interesting little book are sufficiently indicated by the brief and telling preface. It is made up of articles that appeared in *Life* during the three years following August, 1914. "By what processes of sympathy and indignation, through what vicissitudes of diplomacy, delay, and almost despair, we came after two years and a half to the breaking point with Germany, may be traced in a measure in the current of the discourses that follow." The pages are not filled with tragic detail, with patriotic yearning, with bitter denunciation or, of course, with technical discussion. But they do show with remarkable accuracy the stages of despair and hope and wrath through which the writer passed in those dreary years of uncertainty; and he is probably right in thinking that his own reactions, recorded week by week, reflect the emotions of millions of his countrymen. The book then is a document and will be of use, though to us just now not of absorbing interest. It is trite and tiresome to say that the style is the writer's own; of course it is. But, withal, there is something peculiarly personal about this style; it is so very immediate, undisguised, friendly, genial, humorous, serious, light, and still able to carry a considerable burden of thought uncomplainingly. The historical student of the future will get pleasure and profit from pages that have convincing quality because of transparent sincerity.

A. C. McL.

*Canadian Historical Dates and Events, 1492-1915.* By Francis J. Audet, of the Public Archives, Canada. (Ottawa, the Author, 1917, pp. 239, \$3.00.) Only one who has spent wearisome hours searching for a missing date, a needed initial, or some such small and elusive bit of knowledge, can properly appreciate Mr. Audet's collection. Here is presented in compact form a mass of detailed information covering such subjects as chronological lists of Canadian officials of all classes, dates of the sessions of Dominion and provincial legislatures, voyages, treaties, battles, wrecks, fires, and other catastrophes relating to Canadian history, and many facts too miscellaneous to be classified or enumerated. The collection of material has covered a long period of time and Mr. Audet's facilities for gathering it together have been excellent. That the work has been painstakingly done is evidenced by the fact that such lists as those of the governors of the various provinces are more complete than those to be found in Haydn's *Book of Dignities*. On the other hand, the list of treaties relating to Canada is incomplete. Among the omissions are the treaties between Massachusetts and Acadia, concluded at Boston in 1644, and an Anglo-French treaty concluded at Whitehall in 1687. It must be said also that the volume is marred by far too many misprints. Difficult as it is to make perfect a work of this character, it could surely have been brought far nearer that goal by more careful proof-reading. "Clifford Pinchot" (p. 117) is curiously

unfamiliar to our eyes, and we are also prone to wonder why the first names of Mr. Pinchot's colleagues in the commission of 1909 should not have been ascertained.

*The Quest of El Dorado: the Most Romantic Episode in the History of South American Conquest.* By the Reverend J. A. Zahm, C.S.C., Ph.D., (H. J. Mozans). (New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1917, pp. xiv, 261, \$1.50.) This small volume is made up of a series of articles written in 1912 for the *Pan-American Bulletin*. It deserves notice as an account of the numerous expeditions, Spanish, German, and English, which spent their blood and treasure in pursuit of that curious mirage of El Dorado. It is attractively written, but obviously for a popular audience, and as such it should be judged. Even so, one could wish it a bit less exuberant and eulogistic, a bit more critical and informing. We should like to know more of the real El Dorado, of the sacred lake of Guatavita, and of the prince and his people who lived about it. Guatavita, high up in the crater of an extinct volcano, was the religious centre of the Chibcha country. There periodical ceremonies were held, to which came pilgrims from the neighboring tribes, while local hostilities for the moment were suspended. The narrative of the early explorers is often thrilling, but as interesting, if not as romantic, is the story of the native culture, a culture which archaeologists to-day are busy reconstructing.

Dr. Zahm in this, as in earlier books, is very generous toward the Spanish *conquistadores*. That "the prime mover of the Spaniards in their extraordinary adventures was not a thirst for gold . . . but a love of glory and a sense of patriotism" (p. 7), is a thesis to which the reviewer still hesitates to subscribe. And while all credit is due to the almost superhuman endurance and pertinacity of these adventurers, Dr. Zahm is usually silent regarding the darker side of crime and intrigue, and the treatment of the natives. This is the more interesting in view of the rather disparaging tone unconsciously adopted later in the volume toward Raleigh and his Guiana enterprise. Incidentally, in 1595 England and Spain were openly at war, and Raleigh's "privateering work" was quite justifiable.

That Lope de Aguirre reached the Atlantic by way of the Casiquiare and the Orinoco (p. 76), will probably never be proved, and the unique character of the Casiquiare was not reported till over seventy years later. The value of the bullion on the plate fleet destroyed in Vigo Bay in 1702 was not \$100,000,000 (p. 225), but at most about one-fifth of that sum. The proof-reading leaves something to be desired. Among other things, Fernando de Oviedo (pp. 26, 249) should be Fernández de Oviedo, and the autograph (p. 211) attributed to Gaspar de Carvajal is really that of Hernando Pizarro. To lack of proof-reading may perhaps be ascribed the frequent verboseness, especially in chapters X. and XI. The volume is illustrated by excellent pen-and-ink maps, and by photographs of engravings from the early descriptive works of De Bry, Colijn, and Gottfriedt.

C. H.



## COMMUNICATION

[By an accident for which apologies are here made, the following letter, which should have appeared in our issue of last October, has been delayed till now.]

TORONTO, June 13th, 1917.

THE EDITOR OF THE *American Historical Review*:

Sir:

Will you allow me to make a comment upon certain statements in General Chittenden's review of my edition of *David Thompson's Narrative*, in your April number, which are incorrect and consequently misleading as to the value of the *Narrative* to historical students? He says that "the value of the *Narrative* as historic authority is of course quite different from that of the *Journals which have been separately published*". The statement italicised is incorrect. These journals consist of several thousand pages of foolscap size covered with handwriting so fine that they often run six or seven folios to a page. Extracts from them amounting to a very few pages were published by Dr. Coues in his *New Light on the Early History of the Greater Northwest* (New York, 1897), and twenty-one pages were published by Mr. Elliott in the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* for March and June, 1914, after my book had gone to press. The remaining portions of the journals, amounting to far more than 95 per cent. of the whole, have not been published, and it is scarcely likely that they will be published except as scattered fragments in journals of local societies, etc., for they contain a mass of detail of various kinds which is much more useful when it has been synopsized into one volume by the author himself.

General Chittenden strongly emphasizes his statement that, as the *Narrative* was written by Thompson in later life, after his lifework was completed, it is not of equal historical value to his Journals written during the course of his explorations, though he modifies this statement by saying that Thompson had his journals beside him when he was writing, and he therefore accords the published *Narrative* the position of "a most useful supplement to the Journals", which as I have shown are unpublished.

Part I. is an account of life in the country between the Rocky Mountains and Hudson Bay during the latter half of the eighteenth century, and as it is not in journal form it might be subject to the strictures directed against it by the reviewer, but Part II., which deals with the Rocky Mountains and the country to the west of them during the years 1807-1812, is in journal form, and is in fact an abbreviation of his original journals for those years, made by Thompson himself. All the

(711)



journals now known to be in existence were in the hands of the editor when he was preparing this book for the printer, and wherever the *Narrative* varies from the Journals the fact is stated in a foot-note. The marvellous accuracy of this Second Part of the book, which could be, and was, closely compared with the original journals, causes me to place great confidence in statements of personal observations recorded in the First Part of the book, though it might often be difficult, or perhaps impossible, to check these records by reference to the extant journals themselves.

Yours truly,

J. B. TYRRELL.

## HISTORICAL NEWS

### AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The *Annual Report* for 1915 has been distributed (see p. 689, above; vol. II. of that for 1914, the General Index, 1884-1914, is in page-proof.

In previous issues we have mentioned the existence of the "American Historical Society", or, if no such society in reality exists, the fact that a concern calling itself by that name and doing business at 267 Broadway, New York, publishes books which many persons buy under the impression that they are products of the American Historical Association. That there is no connection between the two has been pointedly declared in these pages. We are now informed, by Dr. Elroy M. Avery, that the "American Historical Society" in certain printed blanks gives his name as a member of the "Advisory Board" of one of its publications, and he desires us to state that the use of his name as a member of this "Advisory Board" was without his knowledge or consent previously or now obtained. We are informed that, for the benefit of the publication named (a new cyclopaedia of American biography), different sets of advisory committees are furnished for different sections of the country, and that different names are used by the publishers or projectors, such as the Eastern Historical Publishing Company, the National Americana Society, etc., as well as the American Historical Society.

### NATIONAL BOARD FOR HISTORICAL SERVICE

Upon invitation from the University of London and other British universities and under arrangements made by the Board, Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin of the University of Chicago sails for England during the present month to give, during this spring, courses of lectures, or single lectures, at the University of London, at the Royal Colonial Institute, at the Royal Historical Society, and in the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Belfast, on the relations between American political institutions and those of Great Britain, on Anglo-American interaction, on the historical causes which have led the United States to enter the present war, and in general upon the intellectual position of America in respect to the war and in respect to relations with the allies.

In the series of supplements contributed by the Board to the *History Teacher's Magazine*, three have been issued since the announcement in our January number: *The Study of the Great War, a Topical Outline*,

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—46. (713)

by Professor Samuel B. Harding; *Some War Curiosities and the Clandestine Press in Belgium*, by Professor Christian Gauss; and *A Selected Critical Bibliography of the War*, by Professor George M. Dutcher, embracing some 600 titles, well arranged and with useful comments. These are also available as *War Reprints*, nos. 1, 2, and 3, respectively (Philadelphia, McKinley Publishing Co.). Three additional issues in this series will appear this spring: an outline of the economic effects of the war, a map supplement, and a collection of material relating to France.

More than 600 essays were submitted in the prize essay contest for teachers, instituted by the Board last summer; a detailed announcement of the awards will appear in the *History Teacher's Magazine*.

Under plans framed by the Board, and with syllabi and lantern slides prepared by it, a series of simple historical lectures on the background, origin, and explanation of the war has been given to the soldiers in some thirteen of the great camps, by a selected body of historical teachers, who have pursued the undertaking intensively by repetition from night to night in successive "huts" of the Y. M. C. A. or buildings of the Knights of Columbus, so that many thousands have been reached by the instruction. The service of all the lecturers was gratuitous.

An extended report of the work of the Board was prepared under date of February 12 and distributed to a considerable number of persons who had in one way or another been brought into relation with this work. A copy of this report will be sent to anyone who may be interested, on application to the secretary, 1133 Woodward Building, Washington.

#### PERSONAL

Henry Adams, one of the most distinguished of American historians, perhaps the most keenly intellectual among them, certainly the most accomplished as a writer, died on March 27, a month after completing his eightieth year. Born in 1838, he was the third son of Charles Francis Adams the minister to Great Britain, and served as private secretary to the latter during the whole period of his legation. He was a younger brother of the late Charles Francis Adams the soldier and historian. From 1870 to 1877 he was assistant professor of history in Harvard University. He may fairly be said to have been the first to introduce the seminary method, in its full conception, into American historical instruction; among the fruits was the volume, *Essays in Anglo-Saxon Law* (1876), by himself and three of his pupils. In 1877 he published his *Documents relating to New England Federalism*. From that year he lived in Washington. In 1879 he published his remarkable *Life of Albert Gallatin*, whose writings he also edited, and in

1882 a small volume on John Randolph. Though he was naturally drawn to Gallatin by the latter's striking combination of European culture and wide social experience with American political principles, the books may be regarded as but preliminary studies toward his great work, the *History of the United States during the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison*, which was published in nine volumes in 1889-1891. Thereupon he took his leave of history as an occupation, though in 1893-1894 he held the office of president of the American Historical Association. His *History*, which assumed at once, and has since constantly retained, the highest rank, is mainly a narrative of political, diplomatic, military, and naval events, not because his thought was confined to these, for brilliant chapters testify to the contrary, but because in respect to this period his interest lay chiefly in *la haute politique*, in the management of this infant republic, for the first time, by minds trained under European systems but determined to renounce European social principles. Never has a story of politics and diplomacy been told with greater penetration and acuteness of thought, seldom with more power and distinction of style.

Mr. Adams has given a brilliant account of his life in *The Education of Henry Adams*, which already enjoys a limited fame as a privately printed volume, but which when published will take rank as one of the world's classics of literary autobiography. It is characteristic that in that volume, so rich in thought, in reminiscence, and in charm, there is almost no mention of any of the books we have named. Mr. Adams took up history suddenly at thirty-two, and dropped it at fifty-three. He never lost his interest in it, but his occupation with it was but an incident in an intellectual life so rich, so refined, and so varied that to seek a parallel one might have to search in an older society—for example, among the most enlightened noblemen of eighteenth-century France, whom indeed Mr. Adams, with the free play of his mind, the extraordinary keenness and wit of his conversation, and his essential but somewhat detached benevolence, greatly resembled.

Professor Pasquale Villari of Florence, commemoration of whose ninetieth birthday has been mentioned in these pages, died two months after that date, on December 7. Born at Naples, his sympathy with the liberals of that kingdom compelled him to remove to Florence in 1848. There he wrote his *Savonarola* (1859-1861), his *Machiavelli* (1877-1882), his *Primi Due Secoli della Storia di Firenze* (1893-1894), and his *Invasioni Barbariche* (1901), and an extraordinary number of other historical publications, all which gave him, on the whole, the position of the foremost Italian historian of our time.

Julius Wellhausen, successively professor at Halle, Marburg, and Göttingen, died recently at the age of seventy-three. His fame as a student of Old Testament history began with the publication of *Das*

*Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht* (1871), and was established on the highest level by his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (1898). He was also a noted Arabist.

Dr. Roger B. Merriman has been given the full rank of professor of history in Harvard University.

Professor George M. Dutcher of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut, to whom this portion of our journal is so constantly indebted, will give courses in the University of California during the next summer session.

Dr. Charles Seymour has been advanced to the full rank of professor of history in Yale University.

After six years of service, Professor William W. Rockwell has declined renomination as secretary of the American Society of Church History and as managing editor of its publications; Professor Frederick W. Loetscher of Princeton Theological Seminary was elected as his successor, at the Christmas meeting of the society.

Mr. Frederick W. Hodge, who since 1905 has had charge of the Bureau of American Ethnology at Washington (under the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution), has resigned, to enter the work of the Museum of the American Indian, George G. Heye Foundation, in New York, and has been succeeded by Dr. J. Walter Fewkes.

Miss Elizabeth Donnan of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington is absent on leave during the present semester, teaching in Mount Holyoke College.

Professor Harlow Lindley of Earlham College, director of the Indiana Department of History and Archives, has been granted a leave of absence from April 1 to October 1 this year and will teach in Stanford University.

Professor Edward M. Hulme of the University of Idaho is acting-professor of European history at Stanford University at the present time; in the summer he is to give courses on the Renaissance and the Reformation at the summer session of the University of California.

#### GENERAL

The Yale University Press announces that it will shortly publish *The Processes of History*, by Professor Frederick J. Teggart, of the University of California.

The January number of the *History Teacher's Magazine* is devoted chiefly to studies pertaining to the Great War. The principal articles are: America's Debt to England, by Hon. Lucius B. Swift, and the War and the Teaching of History, by Howard C. Gill. There are briefer

articles under the general title *Suggestions for Secondary Schools*. These are: the *Study of the Roman Republic To-day*, by W. S. Davis; *Points for Emphasis in English History from 1688 to 1815*, by D. D. Wallace; the *Power of Ideals in History*, by D. C. Knowlton; the *United States and World Politics, 1793-1815*, by T. C. Smith; and the *Use of Pictures in the Study of the War*, by E. A. Rice. Finally there is an elaborate *Topical Outline of the War*, by Professor S. B. Harding, mentioned above as prepared in co-operation with the National Board for Historical Service. The February number contains a full report of the conference held at Philadelphia, December 29, 1917, on the *School Course in History*; a *Producing Class in Hispanic-American History*, by C. E. Chapman; and *Some War Curiosities and the Clandestine Press of Belgium*, by Christian Gauss. Under the heading *Timely Suggestions for Secondary Schools* are: the *Roman Empire and the Great War*, by W. L. Westermann; the *Monroe Doctrine and the War*, by Carl Becker; the *Study of English History*, by R. L. Livingston; and a *Turning Point in Far Eastern Diplomacy*, by A. S. Hershey. In the March number, Professor Agnes Hunt has an interesting article on the *War and the Secondary Education of Girls in France*, while the contributions of suggestions for secondary school work, provided by the National Board for Historical Service, include pieces by Professors William D. Gray, Wayland J. Chase, Evarts B. Greene, and Arthur I. Andrews. The *War Supplement* of this number, also prepared in co-operation with the Board, is, as already mentioned, a selected critical bibliography of publications in English, relating to the World War, embracing about six hundred titles, with good comments and arrangement, by Professor George M. Dutcher.

The *American Year Book* for 1917 (Appleton, pp. xx, 822) contains the usual careful and adequate review of the transactions of the year in a multitude of different departments. The accounts of American history, international relations, and foreign affairs, by Professors Edward M. Sait, Robert L. Schuyler, and James A. Woodburn, Charles H. Albrecht, of the Department of State, President Roscoe R. Hill, Mr. Ernest H. Godfrey, Mr. Edward Porritt, Professor Willis F. Johnson, and the military authority who writes under the name of Alexander Martin, jr., will be most immediately serviceable to most students of history.

With its January number the *Military Historian and Economist* begins propitiously its third volume. An English writer, "H. H.", presents a suggestive essay on *Naval History: Mahan and his Successors*; Professor Bonham completes his interesting *Man and Nature at Port Hudson*; and the editor, Professor Johnston, continues his study of *Pope's Campaign in Virginia* by a discussion of *Tactics at Cedar Mountain*. Among the notes the most interesting historically is one which discusses Rogniat's criticisms of Napoleon.

The *Journal of Negro History* presents in its January number an article on Josiah Henson, sometimes said to be the original of Uncle Tom, by W. B. Hartgrove; a brief account of "Palmares, the Negro Numantia" (in Brazil), by Professor Charles E. Chapman, of the University of California, and a valuable article by Miss Delilah L. Beasley on Slavery in California, supported by documents from among the manumission papers at Sacramento. Some 35 pages of this excellent number are occupied with selections from the writings of Jefferson, respecting the negro.

The January number of *History*, the quarterly journal of the Historical Association, completes Professor Firth's paper on the Expulsion of the Long Parliament and contains a symposium on history examinations, which is a report of an informal conference held jointly last autumn by ten public-school masters and five Oxford and Cambridge examiners. Sir Charles P. Lucas has a useful note on the meaning of protectorate.

Two recent books of value, in the same general field, and both published by the Macmillan Company, are the *History of Religion*, by Professor E. W. Hopkins of Yale University, and the *History of the Religion of Israel*, by Professor George A. Barton of Bryn Mawr.

Volume V. of the second series of the *Papers* of the American Society of Church History (New York, Putnam) contains Professor John A. Faulkner's presidential address on the Reformers and Toleration, and the following five papers: Professor Arthur C. Howland, Criminal Procedure in the Church Courts of the Fifteenth Century, as illustrated by the Trial of Gilles de Rais; Henry E. Doshier, Recent Sources of Information on the Anabaptists in the Netherlands; Albert H. Newman, Adam Pastor, Antitrinitarian Antipaedobaptist; F. J. F. Jackson, The Work of Some Recent English Church Historians, with special reference to the Labors of Henry Melville Gwatkin; Jesse Johnson, Early Theological Education West of the Alleghenies.

The twenty-sixth annual meeting of the American Jewish Historical Society was held in Philadelphia, February 11 and 12. The papers read lay more largely than usual in the field of European Jewish history, including one on Graetz, by Professor Gotthard Deutsch, one by Professor Alexander Marx, on Glimpses of the Life of an Italian Rabbi of the First Half of the Sixteenth Century, and one by Dr. Solomon Zeitlin, on the Struggle between the Sects in the Last Days of Jerusalem; but there were also several papers in American Jewish history.

*Jewish Theology Systematically and Historically Considered*, by Dr. Kaufmann Kohler, president of the Hebrew Union College (Macmillan, pp. 500), is intended to serve both as a text-book for students and as a general source of enlightenment for Jewish and Christian readers.



The *American Jewish Year-Book* for the Jewish year 5678 (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1917) contains a paper by Max J. Kohler, reviewing the treatment of Jewish rights at international congresses.

President Cheesman A. Herrick of Girard College has published, through the Macmillan Company, in that firm's "Commercial Series", a *History of Commerce and Industry* (1917, pp. xxv, 562), designed to serve as a text-book in secondary schools, but profitable to many an older scholar.

The Macmillan Company will shortly publish *National Statistics: their History and Development in Europe, America, Australia, and India*, collected from the writings of the leading statisticians of the different lands, and edited by John Koren.

The Harvard University Press is soon to publish a volume by Mr. Denys P. Myers, *Treaties: a Bibliography of Collections of Treaties and Related Material*, which arranges the collections in three groups: by scope of works included, by states, and by subject-matter of the treaties.

The *Annual Report* of the Smithsonian Institution for 1916 (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1917, pp. 607) contains a paper on the Great Dragon of Quirigua, by Dr. W. H. Holmes, one on the Pre-historic Mesa Verde Pueblo and its People, by J. W. Fewkes, one on the Art of the Great Earth-Work Builders of Ohio, by C. C. Willoughby, and a reprint of Sir Arthur Evans's presidential address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1916, entitled *New Archaeological Lights on the Origins of Civilization in Europe*.

The *Life of Naomi Norsworthy*, by Miss Frances C. Higgins (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin, pp. viii, 243), is a pleasing and impressive delineation of the character and influence of an associate-professor in educational psychology in Teachers College, New York, who had extraordinary power to teach and to influence.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. L. Stewart, *Carlyle's Conception of History* (Political Science Quarterly, December); D. P. Myers, *Violation of Treaties: Bad Faith, Non-execution, and Disregard* (American Journal of International Law, October); J. A. R. Marriott, *Modern Diplomacy* (Quarterly Review, January).

#### ANCIENT HISTORY

The *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library for November and December, 1917, contains a bibliography (122 pp.) of material on Assyria and Babylonia possessed by the library.

Franz Cumont has gathered the results of various researches in a volume of *Études Syriennes* (Paris, Picard, 1917). Aside from the

study on the march of the Emperor Julian, the articles deal chiefly with matters related to the history of religion.

Professor Percy Gardner's *History of Ancient Coinage, 700-300 B. C.* (Oxford, Clarendon Press) is a general survey, of great value, which illuminates the political history of Greece by the numismatic evidence, with great learning and ingenuity, through the whole period of Greek independence, with a chapter on the coinage of Philip II. and Alexander.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. T. Olmstead, *Assyrian Government of Dependencies* (American Political Science Review, February); *id.*, *Tiglath-Pileser I. and his Wars* (Journal of the American Oriental Society, October); H. R. James, *The Usages of War in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh Review, January); Frederick Smith, *Athenian Revolutionary Politics in 411 B. C.* (Quarterly Journal of the University of North Dakota, January); W. L. Westermann, *Aelius Gallus and the Restoration of the Irrigation System of Egypt under Augustus* (Classical Philology, July).

#### EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

General review: H. Windisch, *Neuere Literatur zur Religionsgeschichtlichen Erklärung des Neuen Testaments* (Theologisch Tijdschrift, LI. 3, 4).

In a paper of 140 pp. extracted from *Didaskaleion*, anno IV., and entitled *Sant' Agostino e la Decadenza dell' Impero Romano* (Turin, Lib. Ed. Internazionale), Pietro Gerosa examines the arguments of Reuter, *Augustinische Studien* (Gotha, 1887) and of Schilling, *Staats- und Soziallehre des Hl. Augustinus* (Freiburg i. B., 1910) respecting the quality of St. Augustine's patriotism, and finds it quite overborne by his affection for the Church and for the City of God.

In the *Patrologia Orientalis*, edited under the direction of Professors R. Graffin and F. Nau, the third part of the twelfth volume contains the *Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks* of Mufazzal ibn Abil-Fazail, edited with French translation by E. Blochet; the fourth part of the twelfth volume furnishes the Ethiopic text of *Les Miracles de Jésus*, edited with French translation by S. Grébaut; and in the third part of the thirteenth volume Professor Asín y Palacios of Madrid has edited and translated the *Logia et Agrapha Domini Jesu apud Moslemicos Scriptores, Asceticos praesertim*.

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY

The publication of volume III. of the *Cambridge Medieval History* has been subjected to a long delay, caused by the war, which has made new arrangements necessary for the chapters originally confided to Ger-

man and Austrian writers, and by the death of Professor Gwatkin. It is now expected that volume III. can be issued this spring, and the other volumes at normal intervals thereafter; but the price has been raised to £1 a volume.

#### MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The American Society of Church History feels practically assured that, by aid of religious denominations and of a denominational publishing house, it will be possible to bring out in print the unpublished translations of the Latin works of Huldreich Zwingli, prepared by Mr. Henry Preble for the late Dr. Samuel M. Jackson.

Father C. Beccari of the Society of Jesus has recently issued the fourteenth and fifteenth volumes completing his *Rerum Aethiopicarum Scriptores Occidentales Inediti a Saeculo XVI. ad XIX.* (Paris, Picard, 1917). These two volumes respectively contain some documents for the eighteenth century and the index to the whole work.

The score of years, 1643-1663, is covered by the sixth volume of E. Rott's *Histoire de la Représentation Diplomatique de la France auprès des Cantons Suisses, de leurs Alliés, et de leurs Confédérés* (Paris, Alcan, 1917, pp. 1008).

Sir Augustus Oakes and Mr. R. B. Mowat have furnished notes and introductions for the treaties included in the collection *Great European Treaties of the Nineteenth Century*, announced by the Oxford University Press, while Sir Erle Richards has written a general introduction to the entire collection.

The third volume of Édouard Driault's *Napoléon et Europe* is *Tilsit, France et Russie sous le Premier Empire, la Question de Pologne, 1806-1809* (Paris, Alcan, 1917, pp. 491). The volume covers the period from the campaign of Jena to the treaty of Schönbrunn with special attention to eastern affairs and to the intervention in Spain, as well as to the subjects indicated in the title. The author expects to complete his illuminating study of Napoleonic policy in two more volumes.

A. Gauvain studies the period from the Turkish counter-revolution to the affair of Agadir, 1909-1911, in the second volume of his *L'Europe au Jour le Jour* (Paris, Bossard, 1917).

*Les Nations d'après leurs Journaux, Petit Essai de Psychologie de la Presse* (Paris, Bossard, 1917) is a reprint of articles on the press of Germany and Italy published in 1914 in *Les Écrits Français* by Gabriel Arbouin. The young author has since died of wounds received during the Champagne offensive, and Paul Lombard has written a preface for the little volume. The value of the book is attested by the fact that the war has revised few of the judgments expressed.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Chalfant Robinson, *Some Economic Results of the Protestant Reformation Doctrines* (Princeton Theological Review, October); W. K. Boyd, *Political and Social Aspects of Luther's Message* (South Atlantic Quarterly, January); N. Weiss, *La Réforme du XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle, son Caractère, ses Origines, et ses Premières Manifestations jusqu'en 1523* (Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, July-September); H. U. Meyboom, *Scheiding van Kerk en Staat als Historisch Proces* (Theologisch Tijdschrift, LI. 3, 4); J. S. Grieve, *The Naval Operations in the Mediterranean, 1793-1801* (Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, August); É. Driault, *Rome et Napoléon* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, January); F. Chessa, *Il Nazionalismo Economico nel Passato e nel Presente* (Rivista Italiana di Sociologia, March, 1917); J. Rovère, *La Rive Gauche du Rhin, II.-III.* (Revue des Deux Mondes, November 1, December 1); G. M. Trevelyan, *From Waterloo to the Marne* (Quarterly Review, January); J. Y. Simpson, *Russo-German Relations and the Sabouroff Memoirs* (Nineteenth Century, December, January).

#### THE GREAT WAR

Professor G. W. Prothero has enlisted the aid of A. J. Philip in preparing his third list of war books, *Catalogue of War Publications* (London, Murray, 1917, pp. vi, 259) which covers publications to June, 1916. Publications for 1916 are listed in the second issue of *Catalogue: Publications sur la Guerre* (Paris, Cercle de la Librairie, 1917).

The New York Times's *Current History*, now amounting to more than ten volumes of contemporary documents and comments, continues to be the most useful American serial record of the war.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has begun the publication of a series of monographs entitled *Preliminary Studies on Effects of the European War*, written by well-known economists and publicists. They are to be edited by Professor David Kinley of the University of Illinois. Paper-bound copies will be distributed gratuitously upon application to the secretary, 2 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. Cloth-bound copies are to be obtained from the Oxford University Press, American Branch, 35 West 32d Street, New York City. A list of the monographs, so far as already arranged, is as follows (in many cases titles bear the additional words "with special reference to the United States and Great Britain", here omitted): Early Economic Effects of the European War upon Canada, by Professor Adam Shortt of Ottawa; Early Effects of the European War on the Finance, Commerce, and Industry of Chile, by Professor Leo S. Rowe; Economic Effects of the War upon Women and Children in Great Britain, by Irene Osgood Andrews; War Administration of the Railways in the United States and Great Britain, by Professor Frank H. Dixon of Dart-

mouth College and Mr. Julius H. Parmelee, statistician of the Bureau of Railway Economics; Effects of the War upon Insurance, by Professor William F. Kephart; Government War Control of Industry and Trade, by Charles W. Baker; War Administration of Great Britain and the United States, by Professor John A. Fairlie; Effects of the War upon Labor Conditions and Organization, by Professor Matthew B. Hammond; War Finance and Taxation, by President Frank L. McVey; Effects of the War on Negro Labor and Migration in the United States, by Emmett J. Scott; Effects of the War on Shipping, by Professor J. Russell Smith; Agricultural Production and Food Control, by Professor Benjamin H. Hibbard; Price Control, by Professors David Kinley and Simon Litman; Economic and Social Effects of Government Control of the Liquor Business, by Professor Thomas N. Carver; Training of Disabled Soldiers and Sailors for Economic Usefulness, by Professor Edward F. Devine. The first four, monographs of much substantial value, have already appeared, as pamphlets of from 60 to 190 pages.

Professor Munroe Smith has published, through the house of Putnam, a volume entitled *Militarism and Statecraft*, in which are gathered together four articles entitled Military Strategy *versus* Diplomacy, Diplomacy *versus* Military Strategy, The German Theory of Warfare, and German Land Hunger, developing various phases of the history and explanation of the war.

The Society for the Study of the Social Consequences of the War has published, in English, as its third bulletin, a *Study of Fluctuations of the Populations during the World War, I. Germany and France* (Copenhagen, Selskabet for Social Forsken af Krigens Folger, 1917, pp. 141), a serious and important study, though necessarily provisional, in the present state of the statistics.

Mr. Percy Hurd has brought together, and Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton have published, under the title *The War and the Future* (London, New York, Toronto, pp. xxiv, 164), a body of extracts from speeches delivered at various periods of the war, in Canada, the United States, and Great Britain, by Sir Robert Borden, prime minister of the Dominion of Canada. Touching upon a wide variety of topics raised by the war and by Canada's participation, they constitute almost a narrative of that process, and at any rate exhibit forcibly its spirit.

The Creighton Lecture for 1917, delivered at King's College, London, last October, was a discourse by the Regius Professor at Oxford, Dr. Charles H. Firth, which Macmillan and Company have now published in a pamphlet of thirty pages, *Then and Now, or a Comparison between the War with Napoleon and the Present War*, a comparison which the lecturer makes from a wide range of reading and with great interest and suggestiveness.

Of the excellent pamphlet series, *Pages d'Histoire* (Paris, Berger-Levrault) at least 142 numbers have now been issued, furnishing documents, records of events, and material for propaganda. Of *Pages Actuelles* (Paris, Bloud and Gay) 117 numbers have been issued, which are less important for documents or information than for opinion, in which the attitude of French Catholics is reflected. Nine numbers of *Les Cahiers Belges* (Paris, Van Oest) have appeared, devoted to the efforts of the exiled government and people to keep alive their nationality. MM. Geoffroy, Lacour, and Lumet have edited 36 numbers of *La France Héroïque et ses Alliés* (Paris, Larousse), which emphasizes the joint effort and co-operation of the Allies. Of similar character is the series *L'Hommage Français* (Paris, Bloud and Gay) published by the committee, L'Effort de la France et de ses Alliés, of which 21 issues have appeared. Among the twenty-one pamphlets of *La Collection Rouge* (Paris, Alcan) several have been of such significance as to receive separate mention under this caption. The 22d issue of *Guerre de 1914, Documents Officiels, Textes Législatifs et Réglementaires* (Paris, Dalloz) includes acts to November 15, 1917. Of *Les Communiqués Officiels* (Paris, Berger-Levrault) thirty numbers have been published.

The fourth volume of Professor Gaston Jèze's *Les Finances de Guerre de l'Angleterre* (Paris, Giard and Brière, 1917) deals with the advance of public expenditure and financial control. Professor Georges Renard of the College of France has published a volume on *Les Répercussions Économiques de la Guerre Actuelle sur la France, 1<sup>er</sup> Août 1914-15 Mai 1917* (Paris, Alcan, 1917); H. Remy, on *La Question des Sucres et le Ravitaillement de la France pendant la Période 1914 à 1917* (Paris, Tenin, 1917); and M. Pantaleoni, on *Tra le Incognite Problemi suggeriti dalla Guerra* (Bari, Laterza, 1917, pp. 286), and *Note in Margine della Guerra* (*ibid.*, pp. 266), both of which deal mainly with the economic aspects of the war.

In *France Bears the Burden* (Macmillan), Maj. Granville Fortescue describes the fight on the Somme, at Verdun, and in the Argonne, and gives some account of the organization and practice of war as developed by France during three years.

*Der Deutsche Chauvinismus*, originally published by Professor Ottfried Nippold of the University of Berne in 1913, is available in a new edition (Berne, Wyss, 1917, pp. 197) which is a literal reprint of the original except for the addition of a new preface. The work is a collection of utterances by German journals and speakers in 1912-1913, with some discussion.

Under the title *Who was Responsible for the War? The Verdict of History*, and with a preface by Dr. H. Nelson Gay, the Paris firm of

Bloud and Gay has issued, in a small book of 120 pages, a body of addresses, often illuminating as to recent diplomatic history, by Senator Tommaso Tittoni, who during most of the years from 1903 to 1916 was either Italian minister for foreign affairs or Italian ambassador in Paris.

C. Demblon, deputy from Liège, now professor at Rennes, is author of *La Guerre à Liège, Pages d'un Témoin* (Paris, Librairie Anglo-Française, 1917). The second volume of General Palat's *La Grande Guerre sur le Front Occidental* (Paris, Chapelot, 1918) relates to Liège, Mulhouse, Sarrebourg, and Morhange. Louis Madelin, who has enjoyed special opportunities of observation through a staff appointment, has collected several of his articles in *La Mêlée des Flandres; l'Yser et Ypres* (Paris, Plon, 1917, pp. xviii, 235).

*Avec une Batterie de 75, le Tube 1233, Souvenirs d'un Chef de Pièce, 1915-1916* (Paris, Plon, 1917, pp. xxii, 289) completes an earlier volume of souvenirs of Paul Lintier. Lieutenant J. Pinguet narrates *Trois Étapes de la Brigade des Marins, la Marne, Gand, Dixmude* (Paris, Perrin, 1918); Paul Dubrulle, *Mon Régiment dans la Fournaise de Verdun, dans la Bataille de la Somme* (Paris, Plon, 1918).

The eleventh volume of Joseph Reinach's *Les Commentaires de Polybe* (Paris, Fasquelle, 1917, pp. xii, 422) runs from January 1 to March 16, 1917, and gives special attention to the steps which were leading the United States into the war. The third volume of *L'Invasion des Barbares* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1917) by A. Masson concludes at June 30, 1916.

Among the additions to the literature of the Alsace-Lorraine question are G. Weill, *L'Alsace Française de 1789 à 1870* (Paris, Alcan, 1916, pp. 134); *L'Alsace et la Lorraine* (Toulouse, Sirven, 1917, pp. 360, 400 illustrations), with preface by Maurice Barrès and articles by a dozen experts; J. Hoche, *En Alsace Reconquise, 1917* (Paris, Michel, 1917, pp. 319); and Abbé Wetterlé, *L'Alsace-Lorraine doit rester Française* (Paris, Delagrave, 1917).

R. Johannet has edited *Pan-Germanism versus Christendom, the Conversion of a Neutral* (New York, Doran, 1917, p. xii, 184) which contains a letter by Prüm, the Catholic leader in Luxemburg, to Erzberger, the German Catholic leader, some account of Prüm's trial, and an account of the evolution of the German Catholic Centre. The book forms one of the most convincing arguments against Germany.

Messrs. Constable announce a new series entitled *The Operations of the British Army in the Present War*. The first volume of the series is to be *The Retreat from Mons*, with an introduction by Lord French. A record of the campaigns of the Australians in Europe and Egypt, *Byways of Service*, by Lieut. Hector Dunning, comes from the same publisher.



Under the title *The Old Front Line* (Macmillan), meaning the front line of the British forces as it was when the Battle of the Somme began, Mr. John Masefield presents an account of that battle and of the attendant campaign in France, corresponding in a degree to his previous narrative of the Gallipoli campaign.

*The Irish on the Somme* (Hodder and Stoughton) is the second series of *The Irish at the Front*, by Michael MacDonagh. An introduction is furnished by the late John Redmond.

*Letters of a Canadian Stretcher Bearer*, by R. A. L. (Little, Brown), have been edited by Anna Chapin Ray. Other personal narratives of war experiences are *Section Sixty-one*, selections from letters of Henry S. Kingman, of the Norton-Harjes ambulance corps (privately printed); *Holding the Line*, by Sergt. Harold Baldwin, of the First Division, Canadian expeditionary forces (McClurg); *Besieged in Kut, and after*, by Maj. Charles H. Barber (Blackwood); *The Motor-Bus in War*, by A. M. Beatson (Unwin); *Khaki Courage* (Lane), by Coningsby W. Dawson; *A Yankee in the Trenches*, by R. Derby Holmes (Little, Brown); *Facing the Hindenburg Line*, by Burris A. Jenkins (Revell); and *On the Right of the British Line*, by Capt. Gilbert Hobbs (Scribners).

O. Guiheneuc has attempted an account of *La Bataille de Jutland* (Paris, Perrin, 1917). Lieutenant Fernand Barde records experiences in the Channel, at the Dardanelles, and in the Levant, in *Vingt Mois de Guerre, à Bord du Croiseur "Jeanne d'Arc", 9 Août 1914-12 Avril 1916* (*ibid.*, 1918).

*Ambulance 464: Encore des Blessés*, by Julien H. Bryan (Macmillan), presents vividly the experiences of a Princeton junior, a boy of seventeen, who went to the war and drove an ambulance car in the Verdun and Champagne sectors.

Mr. Ward Price, in *The Story of the Salonica Army* (Hodder and Stoughton), has recounted, as fully apparently as the censor would allow him to, the purposes of the Salonika expedition and the impediments to accomplishing these purposes.

Messrs. Dodd, Mead, and Company have announced a *Roumanian Diary, 1915, 1916, 1917*, by Lady Kennard.

The relations of the war to what a previous generation called the Eastern Question are set forth in *La Guerre d'Orient et la Crise Européenne* (Paris, Alcan, 1916), by Paul Louis; in *L'Orient Méditerranéen, Impressions et Essais sur quelques Éléments du Problème Actuel* (Paris, Perrin, 1917), by A. Duboscq; in *France et Liban, Défense des Intérêts Français en Syrie* (*ibid.*), by F. Tyan; in *L'Italia e il Mar di Levante* (Milan, Trèves, 1917, pp. 224), by P. Revelli; and in *L'Expé-*

*dition des Dardanelles d'après les Documents Officiels Anglais* (Paris, Payot, 1917, pp. 248), by Testis, who supplements his observations with translations of the reports of Sir Ian Hamilton and Vice-Admiral Robeck, which appear in English in *Ian Hamilton's Despatches from the Dardanelles* (London, Newnes).

Dr. Harry Stuermer's *Zwei Kriegsjahre in Constantinopel* has been translated from the German by the author, assisted by Mr. E. Allen, and published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton as *Two War Years in Constantinople: Sketches of German and Young Turkish Ethics and Politics*.

*The Long Road to Baghdad* by Mr. Edmund Candler, the official correspondent with the British expeditionary force, recounts the history of the Mesopotamian campaign (Cassell).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: *Sinn Fein and Germany* (Quarterly Review, January); Major T. E. Compton, *The Battles of August, 1914, in Lorraine and the Ardennes* (Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, August); L. Madelin, *Devant Verdun* (Revue Hebdomadaire, October 13, 20); D. Thévenin, *Sur la Somme, Août-Septembre 1916* (Mercure de France, December 1); A. Chevrillon, *De l'Ancre à Péronne, Avril 1917, Les Champs de Bataille* (Revue de Paris, December 1); R. G. Lévy, *Le Ravitaillement du Nord de la France et de la Belgique* (Revue des Deux Mondes, November 15); X., *La Coopération Militaire Anglaise* (Mercure de France, December 16); R. Recouly, *La Mission de M. Jonnart en Grèce, I.* (Revue des Deux Mondes, December 15); Commandant E. Vedel, *La Marine Française pendant la Guerre, La Deuxième Escadre Légère à la Rencontre de la Flotte Allemande, 2 Août 1914* (*ibid.*, November 15); G. Hanotaux, *L'Union de la France et de l'Amérique* (Revue Hebdomadaire, November 10); F. Crispolti, *Intorno alla Nota Pontificia sulla Pace* (Nuova Antologia, September 16); G. Dalla Torre, *L'Appello di Pace del Papa e la Risposta di Wilson* (*ibid.*); G. Jèze, *L'Exécutif en Temps de Guerre, les Pleins Pouvoirs, II., III.* (Revue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique en France et à l'Étranger, April, July, 1917).

(See also p. 742)

#### GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

The Yale University Press has brought out this spring *An Outline Sketch of English Constitutional History*, by Professor George B. Adams.

The Harvard University Press will shortly publish, as vol. XVIII. of the *Harvard Economic Studies*, a study of the *Ancient Customs Duties of England*, by Professor N. S. B. Gras, of Clark University.

Miss Dorothy Hughes's *Illustrations of Chaucer's England* (Longmans, 1918, pp. xiv, 302), figuring as the first of a series of "University

of London Intermediate Source-Books of History", is a volume of extracts from chronicles and documents selected with good judgment and provided with suitable head-notes. Though prepared for the purpose which its title indicates, it can be made of good use in history classes, the main topics being the French War, social, ecclesiastical, and constitutional history.

The University of Minnesota *Studies in the Social Sciences*, no. 8, is *The Petition of Right* (pp. 74), by Dr. Frances H. Relf, an intensive study intended to bring out the importance of procedure in the case, the author maintaining that, in failing to explain why the Commons proceeded by petition instead of bill, as they first tried to do, Gardiner as well as other writers have missed the most significant fact.

The Manorial Society has reprinted the first edition (1635) of Sir Charles Calthrope's readings on *The Relation betweene the Lord of a Mannor and the Coppy-Holder, His Tenant* (1 Mitre Court Buildings, Temple, London, E. C., 1917).

A recent edition of Bolingbroke's *Letters on the Spirit of Patriotism and on the Idea of a Patriot-King* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, pp. xxix, 141) contains an excellent introduction by Mr. A. Hassall, succinctly setting forth the facts of Bolingbroke's life, and the political conditions in England which called forth these two expressions of Bolingbroke's faith. The closing pages of the introduction Mr. Hassall devotes to tracing the influence of Bolingbroke's writings on later English history.

*The Influence of the French Revolution in English History*, by the late Philip A. Brown, is soon to be published by Messrs. Crosby Lockwood, with an introductory memoir by Professor Gilbert Murray. The work was left by the author in an unrevised state when he enlisted in the First Hundred Thousand.

*The Paget Brothers, 1790-1840*, edited by Lord Hylton (London, Murray), contains the family letters of six brothers and their many relatives and friends. All were good and lively letter-writers and the interest of the correspondence may be judged from the fact that one was a famous general (Lord Uxbridge), one a vice-admiral, another a captain R. N., another an ambassador, another a general, and the youngest a Lord of the Treasury.

Two essays, one by Mr. G. P. Gooch, the other by Canon J. H. B. Masterman, brought together under the title of *A Century of British Foreign Policy* (Council for Study of International Relations), summarize foreign policy from Waterloo to 1914.

*L'Impérialisme Britannique et le Rapprochement Franco-Anglais, 1900-1903*, by Jean Carrère (Paris, Perrin), is a series of sketches of British personages of two decades ago.

*Cecil Rhodes: Man and Empire-Maker*, a memoir by Princess Catherine Radziwill, is soon to be published by Messrs. Cassell.

*War-time Control of Industry: the Experiences of England*, by Professor Howard L. Gray of Bryn Mawr College (Macmillan), describes the British dealings with the railways, with matters of commerce and labor, the coal mines, wool and woollens, hides and leather, shipping, food, sugar, meat, bread, and agriculture.

The Scottish History Society has in preparation the *Records of the University of St. Andrews*, 1411-1560, to be edited by Dr. J. Maitland Anderson; the second volume of the *Seafield Correspondence*, edited by Major James Grant; the *Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of Edinburgh, and some other Brethren of the Ministry* (1653 ff.), edited by Rev. W. Stephen; *Charters and Documents relating to the Grey Friars and the Cistercian Nunnery of Haddington, and the Register of Inchcolm Monastery*, edited by J. G. Wallace-James; an analytical catalogue, by J. T. Clark, of the Wodrow Collection of manuscripts in the Advocates' Library; and a translation of the *Historia Abbatum de Kynlos* of Ferrerius.

The Committee on Publications of the University of Aberdeen, which some time ago published Mr. Kellas Johnstone's *Concise Bibliography of Aberdeen, Banff, and Kincardine*, has now followed this with a *Concise Bibliography of the Printed and Manuscript Material on the History, Topography, and Institutions of the Burgh, Parish, and Shire of Inverness*, by P. J. Anderson, librarian of the University. These volumes will be followed by three others, covering the region northwards to Orkney and Shetland.

Mr. J. G. Swift MacNeill has written *The Constitutional and Parliamentary History of Ireland till the Union*, which is soon to be published by Fisher Unwin.

Mr. Timothy M. Healy in *The Great Fraud of Ulster* (Dublin, Gill and Son, 1917) attempts to set forth in briefer form and less legalistic aspect the facts which he presented some years ago in *Stolen Waters*, reviewed in this journal in October, 1913 (XIX. 146).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. L. R. Beaven, *King Edmund I. and the Danes of York* (English Historical Review, January); Thomas Baty, *Scottish Prize Decisions of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Yale Law Journal, February); Col. C. Field, *The Marines in the Great Naval Mutinies, 1797-1802* (Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, November); F. J. Klingberg, *A General Survey of the Anti-Slavery Movement in England* (South Atlantic Quarterly, January); Algernon Cecil, *Two Distinguished Gladstonians* [Acton and Morley] (Quarterly Review, January); M. Caudel, *L'Em-*

*pire Britannique et la Guerre* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, October); Spenser Wilkinson, *The British Constitution and the Conduct of War* (Nineteenth Century, January).

#### FRANCE

To the *Great Nations* series, projected by Messrs. Harrap (London), Mr. William H. Hudson has contributed *France: the Nation and its Development from Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Third Republic*. The volume, which treats with much greater fullness of early French history than of the period of the Revolution and subsequent events, was obviously prepared for the immature student. A more valuable book, we must expect, is the brief volume which is announced as to come from the pen of Madame Duclaux, better known as Miss A. Mary F. Robinson or as Madame Darmesteter.

The tenth and eleventh centuries furnish the subject for the fourth volume of *Les Origines de l'Ancienne France* (Paris, Tenin, 1917) by Professor J. Flach of the College of France. The earlier volumes appeared in 1886, 1893, and 1904.

Baron le Barrois d'Orgeval has made his doctoral thesis upon *La Justice Militaire sous l'Ancien Régime, le Tribunal de la Connétablie de France du XIV<sup>e</sup> Siècle à 1790* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1918).

Everyman's Library has begun the publication of the *Memoirs of Cardinal de Retz*.

The Société de l'Histoire de France has published the second volume of the *Mémoires de Louis Henri de Loménie, Comte de Brienne, dit le Jeune Brienne* (Paris, Laurens, 1917), edited by P. Bonnefon, which relate to the reign of Louis XIV.

Adrien Launay has completed his *Mémorial de la Société des Missions Étrangères* (Paris, Séminaire des Missions Étrangères, 1916) with a second volume. The work includes a wealth of biographical and bibliographical data relating to the personnel of French Catholic missions, especially in the Far East.

The most recent issue of the *Bibliothèque de la Société de l'Histoire de la Révolution Française* is *Les Séances des Députés du Clergé aux États Généraux en 1789, Journaux du Curé Thibault et du Chanoine Coster* (Paris, 1917, pp. xxxvi, 184), edited by Albert Houtin. The nature of the editor's work has drawn from G. Rouanet two long and detailed critical studies published in the *Annales Révolutionnaires* of October, 1916, and January, 1917, which should receive the attention of all who have occasion to consult the volume.

In 1891, in the fourth appendix to the second volume of his *French Revolution*, Professor H. Morse Stephens undertook to establish the

personnel of the Girondin party in the National Convention, and he made a list of 183 names. Ten years later, Professor Aulard in his *Histoire Politique de la Révolution Française* (part 2, chapter 7) included but 165 names in his list. A list of 191 names is established by C. Perroud in *La Proscription des Girondins, 1793-1795* (Paris, Alcan, 1917, pp. xvi, 326). In this little volume the biographer of the Rolands and of Brissot has collected a mass of data on the proscription, execution, and other fortunes of the Girondins following May, 1793. He frankly disavows any attempt to write a history of the Girondins, but he declares of his book, "Il est Girondin, parce que je suis du côté du courage et du malheur."

Professor Albert Mathiez of the University of Besançon, the able and scholarly editor of the *Annales Révolutionnaires*, has reprinted from that and other reviews, under the title *Études Robespierriennes* (Paris, Colin, 1917, pp. 327), seven articles to which he has added a new study on the Danton legend. The introductory article on parliamentary corruption under the Terror prefaces studies of Danton's fortune and accounts, of the Abbé Espagnac, and of Julien de Toulouse, all of which accumulate proofs of the peculations of Danton and of his group. They, however, present only a portion of the evidence which he has assiduously collected and published in the *Annales Révolutionnaires* and elsewhere in the last decade. The title of the volume is more obviously justified by the two concluding papers on the policy of Robespierre and the Ninth Thermidor based on notes of Buonarroti, and on Robespierre the orator. It is unfortunate that a controversial tone pervades the work which causes hesitation about accepting conclusions for which proofs are accumulated with such careful scholarship.

Three volumes of a new edition of *Correspondance, Bulletins, et Ordres du Jour de Napoléon* (Paris, Méricant, 1917) have been issued by Alexandre Keller, which extend to the treaty of Leoben.

Louis Lumet has furnished an interesting addition to the iconography of Napoleon in *Napoléon 1er Empereur des Français* (Paris, Nilsson, 1917), which contains 348 selected illustrations.

Henri Cordey, a former Protestant pastor in Paris, has written an exhaustive study of *Edmond de Pressensé et son Temps, 1824-1891* (Paris, Fischbacher, 1916, pp. x, 600) which is practically a history of Protestant thought and activity in France in the four decades following the Revolution of 1848. *Le Mouvement Catholique en France de 1830 à 1850* (Paris, Bloud and Gay, 1917, pp. 272) has special reference to the education question culminating in the Loi Falloux, 1850, and is by Fernand Mourret, the author of the *Histoire Générale de l'Église*.

Hans Morf, the Paris correspondent of the *Basler Nachrichten*, in *Demokratie und Krieg in Frankreich* (Zurich, Bascher, 1917, pp. 150)

surveys current conditions in France to answer for his Swiss readers whether a democracy can successfully conduct war.

An important and interesting chapter of French colonial enterprise is recorded by Colonel Baratier in *Au Congo, Souvenirs de la Mission Marchand* (Paris, Fayard, 1917, pp. 126).

In *Le Maroc de 1917* (Paris, Payot, 1917, pp. 246) Henry Dugard reviews the ten years of French occupation, describes various present conditions and recent events, and presents various considerations with regard to the future development of the country. The recent achievements and present activities of the French in Morocco are fully set forth in *Les Énergies Françaises au Maroc* (Paris, Plon, 1917) by Comte de la Revelière. Of more limited scope is *Au Maroc, Fès, la Capitale du Nord* (Paris, Roger, 1917) by M. de Périgny. The obscure title, *Le Maroc sous les Boches, Voyage de Guerre, 1916* (Paris, Bossard, 1917, pp. 200) of Jean Ajalbert covers some account of German prisoners in Morocco, recent French campaigning in Morocco, and the participation of Moroccan soldiers in the fighting on the West Front.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. Flach, *Comment la Domination Germanique avait été Usurpée sur le Sud-Est de la France* (Compte Rendu de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, November); P. Orsi, *Come si Arrivò alla Rivoluzione Francese dai "Dispacci" degli Ambasciatori Veneti* (Nuova Antologia, September 1); A. Mathiez, *La Mobilisation des Savants en l'An II*. (Revue de Paris, December 1); M. Dussarp, *Roger Ducos et sa Mission à Landrecies en l'An III., I*. (Revue Historique de la Révolution Française et de l'Empire, 1917, nos. 1, 2, 3); A. Mathiez, *Le Carnet de Robespierre, Essai d'Édition Critique* (Annales Révolutionnaires, January); G. de Novvion, *Le Papier-Monnaie de la Révolution* (Journal des Économistes, November 15); A. Aulard, *Le Patriotisme et la Révolution Française, les Émigrés* (La Révolution Française, September); G. Weill, *Le Financier Ouvrard* (Revue Historique, January); A. Chuquet, *Napoléon à Grenoble* (Revue de Paris, November 1, 15); J. Reinach, *Gambetta-Souvenirs Personnels* (Mercure de France, January 1); V. Giraud, *Esquisses Contemporaines, Albert de Mun* (Revue des Deux Mondes, October 15, November 1).

#### ITALY AND SPAIN

General Review: J. Alazard and J. Luchaire, *Histoire d'Italie, Période Moderne, Fin du XV<sup>e</sup> Siècle—Fin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle, III*. (Revue Historique, January).

The King of Italy is suing to prevent the Marquises Cosimo and Averardo de' Medici Tornaquinci from selling at auction the portion of the Medici archives mentioned on p. 461 of our last issue as to be sold in London in February.



*The Bloodless War* (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1917, pp. xi, 263) is the translation by Bernard Miall of an account by Ezio M. Gray of German economic penetration in Italy before the war, especially in banking matters.

The title of Professor R. B. Merriman's forthcoming work was stated in our last number in a form not representing adequately its scope. The book is entitled *The Rise of the Spanish Empire in the Old World and in the New*. It is to be published in four volumes, with maps, and the first two volumes, dealing with the Middle Ages and the Catholic Kings, are published this spring.

The fortieth volume of *Actas de las Cortes de Castilla, publicadas por acuerdo del Congreso de los Diputados* (Madrid, Fortanet, 1917) contains the proceedings from October 14, 1623, to February 18, 1624.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Armstrong, *The Medici Archives* (English Historical Review, January); Arundel del Re, *The Medici Archives* (Edinburgh Review, January); J. de Narfon, *Les Catholiques Italiens, la Question Romaine et la Guerre* (Revue Hebdomadaire, November 10); M. Serrano y Sanz, *Notas acerca de los Judios Aragoneses en los Siglos XIV. y XV.* (Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos, September).

#### GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

*La Morale Politique du Grand Frédéric, d'après sa Correspondance* (Paris, Plon, 1917, pp. 590). by Commandant Weil, is in large measure a compilation of selected passages from Frederick's correspondence.

Some account of the conditions and of the new ideas and methods of German education in the years preceding the war is given by V. H. Friedel in *La Pédagogie de Guerre Allemande* (Paris, Fischbacher, 1917, pp. xv, 303). The volume is based on careful study and contains various documents in whole or in part.

*La Formation Sociale du Prussien Moderne* (Paris, Colin, 1916, pp. 368) by Paul Descamps was largely written before the war as a pendant to his *La Formation Sociale de l'Anglais Moderne* and contains constant comparisons between Englishman and Prussian. The author is a disciple of LePlay.

*A Bulwark against Germany: the Fight of the Slovenes, the Western Branch of the Jugo-Slavs, for National Existence*, by Dr. Bogumil Vosnjak, former lecturer at the University of Zagreb (Agram) (London, George Allen and Unwin, 1917, pp. 270), is a handy volume in which Slovenian history and anti-Austrian argument are mingled and which contains much useful, though not colorless, information respecting the Slovenes and their cause.

A study of the first case of international neutralisation in modern Europe is made by E. Payen in *La Neutralisation de la Suisse et de la Savoie* (Paris, Bossard, 1917).

M. I. Grunberg, editor of the *Argus Suisse de la Presse*, has undertaken to compile the statutes, proclamations, and other documents of official action of Switzerland with reference to the war and the conditions created by it for the nation, in *La Suisse Neutre et Vigilante, Comment la Suisse a Maintenu sa Neutralité et Comment Elle a Assuré la Sécurité du Pays* (Geneva, Argus de la Presse), of which the first volume, containing the documents for 1914, has appeared and volumes for the three succeeding years are announced for early publication.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. W. Thompson, *Church and State in Mediaeval Germany*, I. (American Journal of Theology, January); J. Herderschee, *Luther's Laatste Levensdagen* (Theologisch Tijdschrift, LI. 5); R. Reuss, *Les Débuts de la Réforme à Strasbourg, 1517-1524* (Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, July); V. du Bled, *La Jeunesse de Frédéric II.* (Revue Hélio-madaire, November 17); J. Declareuil, "Les Discours à la Nation Allemande" de J.-Gottlieb Fichte (Revue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique, July); P. Louis, *La Social-Démocratie Allemande après le Congrès de Würzburg* (Mercure de France, February 1).

#### NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

Professor C. Nyrop of Copenhagen has written an account of the *Arrestation des Professeurs Belges et l'Université de Gand* (Paris, Payot, 1917, pp. 85) of which the French translation is by E. Philipot. The account deals chiefly with the cases of Professors Pirenne and Fredericq. A general survey of *La Question Flamande et l'Allemagne* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917) is furnished by F. Passelecq. Baron H. Kervyn de Lettenhove deals with *La Guerre et les Oeuvres d'Art en Belgique, 1914-1916* (Paris, Van Oest, 1917). The Belgian minister Carton de Wiart is the author of *La Politique de l'Honneur* (Paris, Bloud et Gay, 1917). Commandant Willy Breton of the Belgian army has published an illustrated description of the Belgian munition plants in France under the title, *Les Établissements d'Artillerie Belges pendant la Guerre* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917). A biographical sketch of *Cardinal Mercier* (Paris, Perrin, 1918) is by G. Goyau.

Baron C. Buffin has collected and Alys Hallard translated selections from the narratives of Belgian soldiers under the title *Brave Belgians* (Putnam, 1918, pp. xii, 377). Among the selections is a considerable portion of the narrative of Dr. Duwez.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Rain, *Une Page de l'Histoire de Liège, la Révolution de 1790 et le Prince Ferdinand de Rohan* (Revue

d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXI. 2); Brand Whitlock, *Belgium* (Everybody's Magazine, February *et seq.*); H. Davignon, *Machiavel en Belgique, le Baron von Bissing* (Revue Hebdomadaire, October 13).

#### NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

General review: N. Voulitch, *Histoire des Yougoslaves* (Revue Historique, January).

The directors of the Carlsberg Fund, in their latest report (November) respecting the progress of Madame Bang's important compilation of the accounts of the Sound Dues, 1661-1800, the preparation of which was calculated to take ten years, report that at the end of five years almost one-half of the necessary labors have been completed. The results, as we have mentioned before, will be of great value to the history of Baltic commerce and there should have been important American contributions to its sustainment.

Mr. C. Henry Smith of San Francisco has endowed to the amount of \$5,000 an *Illustrated History of Scandinavian Art*, to be prepared, under the auspices of the American-Scandinavian Foundation, by Professors Carl G. Laurin, Jens Thijs, and Emil Hannover, of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark respectively.

Count F. U. Wrangel has published *Voyage en France d'Oxenstiern, 1635* (Paris, Plon, 1917) and *Choix de Lettres Intimes d'un Épicurien du XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle, Comte Jean d'Oxenstiern, publié d'après les Originaux Inédits de la Bibliothèque de Stockholm* (Paris, Chevrel, 1917). The first relates to a diplomatic journey made by the great Swedish chancellor, and the second to his son who was one of the representatives in the negotiation of the treaties of Westphalia.

*Through the Russian Revolution* by Claude Anet, now translated (London, Hutchinson), has both the merits and the faults of history written by an eye-witness. Despite the drawbacks of such accounts each additional one adds something to our understanding of what is occurring in Russia.

In "*The Dark People*": *Russia's Crisis*, Mr. Ernest Poole takes up the recent history of Russia in various aspects—Petrograd, the Kerensky government, the various political parties, the Council of Workmen and Soldiers, the army, the railroads, problems of labor and industry, food and supplies, and most of all the peasants—in an endeavor to discover the constructive forces at work building the nation.

The Russian Revolution of 1917 has also called forth the following volumes: Princesse Lucien Murat, *Raspoutine et l'Aube Sanglante* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1917); A. Masson, *Histoire Complète de la Révolution Russe* (*ibid.*); Marylie Markovitch (M<sup>me</sup>. Amélie de Néry), *La Révo-*

*lution Russe vue par une Française* (Paris, Perrin, 1917); Rheta Childe Dorr, *Inside the Russian Revolution* (New York, Macmillan, 1917, pp. 243) (the author went to Russia in May, 1917); E. Vandervelde, *Trois Aspects de la Révolution Russe, 7 Mai-25 Juin 1917* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917), by the Belgian socialist leader, who visited Petrograd, the factories, and the armies.

The papers presented at the recent meeting of the American Historical Association by Professors Samuel N. Harper, Alexander Petrunkevitch, Frank A. Golder, and Robert J. Kerner (see p. 516, above) have been published under the title, *The Russian Revolution and the Jugo-Slavs* (Harvard University Press).

Under the title *The Little Grandmother of the Russian Revolution* (Boston, Little, Brown), the letters and reminiscences of the venerated heroine Madame Catherine Breshkovsky are presented in English translation, edited by Alice Stone Blackwell.

Two anonymous volumes on *Die Lettische Revolution, 1907* (Berlin, Reimer, 1917) are an accompaniment of the German conquest of the Baltic provinces.

A. Mandelstam, formerly connected with the Russian embassy at Constantinople, reviews the Young Turk rule, the Turkish entry into the war, Turkish relations with Germany, and discusses the future of the Ottoman territories in *Le Sort de l'Empire Ottoman* (Paris, Payot, 1917, pp. xii, 631). He advances the thesis of a "human right" of international intervention in Ottoman affairs. A recent volume by B. Bareilles deals with *Les Turcs, Ce que fut leur Empire* (Paris, Perrin, 1917). Victor Bérard writes the preface to *Le Problème Turc* (Paris, Leroux, 1917, pp. xiii, 272) which is a discussion of French policy in the Levant, apparently by a Christian long resident under Ottoman rule.

E. Pittard, professor of anthropology in the University of Geneva, deals with the racial question in *La Roumanie* (Paris, Bossard, 1917). Professor N. Jorga has added to his volumes mentioned in the last issue a *Histoire des Relations Anglo-Roumaines* (Jassy, Neâmul Romanesc, 1917, pp. 178). A volume of *Notes sur la Guerre Roumaine, 1916-1917* (Paris, Payot, 1917) is by N. P. Comnène.

Ernest Daudet begins a series *Les Complices des Auteurs de la Guerre* with a volume on *Ferdinand I<sup>er</sup> Tsar de Bulgarie* (Paris, Attinger, 1917) in which he surveys the thirty years of the reign and adduces not a few proofs of acts by no means admirable in the Bulgarian ruler.

*Cinq Ans d'Histoire Grecque, 1912-1917* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917) contains authorized translations by Léon Maccas of speeches made in the Greek chamber of deputies in August, 1917, by E. Veni-

zelos and members of his ministry discussing the events since the beginning of the Balkan wars. L. Maccas also surveys events of the same period in *Constantin Ier Roi des Hellènes* (Paris, Bossard, 1917, pp. 93). R. Vaucher has published *Constantin Détroné, les Évènements de Grèce, Février-Août 1917* (Paris, Perrin, 1918); and A. Gauvain, *L'Affaire Grecque* (Paris, Bossard, 1917).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. W. Bienstock, *La Révolution Russe, Kornilov* (Mercure de France, January 1, 15); N., *Trotsky* (New Europe, January 17).

#### THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

Mr. A. Barton Hepburn, of the Chase National Bank, has made a gift of 125,000 yen to the Imperial University of Tokio, to found a professorship of the constitution, history, and diplomacy of the United States. It is understood that the first incumbent is to be Dr. Inazo Ota Nitobé.

Professor Kenneth S. Latourette, of Denison University, brings out through the Macmillan Company a book of modern Japanese history entitled *The Development of Japan*.

*What I saw in the Orient* is a result of Mr. Frederick Coleman's two years in the Far East, years in which he has been studying the effects of the war there (Cassell).

Volume V. of *The Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai, from 1736 to 1761* (Madras, Government Press), translated from the Tamil, carries the diary of this agent of Dupleix from April 1 to October 17, 1748.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. L. Pérez, *Fr. Francisco de Jesús Escalona y su Relacion de China [1636-1640]* (Archivum Franciscanum Historicum, July, 1915), A. Bellessort, *Le Nouveau Japon*, I. (Revue des Deux Mondes, December 1); Wen-Sze Ching, *The Treaty Relations between China and the United States relating to Commerce* (Chinese Social and Political Science Review, September); Col. R. G. Burton, *A Hundred Years Ago, the Mahratta and Pindari War* (Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, November).

#### AFRICA

A volume soon to appear from the press of Messrs. Routledge (London) is *Select Constitutional Documents illustrating the History of South Africa, 1795-1910*, edited by G. W. Eybers.

The history of modern missionary work receives a useful contribution in Dr. H. K. W. Kumm's *African Missionary Heroes and Heroines* (Macmillan). Dr. Kumm, in addition to his sketches of the work of various African workers, adds a list of Christian missionary societies in Africa, some geographical notes, and a bibliography.

## AMERICA

## GENERAL ITEMS

The War Department, following the example of most European governments, has established an Historical Section of the General Staff, and entrusted it with the duty of making preparations for an eventual history of the present war with Germany. The section, whose creation will be cordially welcomed by historical scholars, is placed under the charge of Lieut.-Col. C. W. Weeks, of the General Staff.

Among the recent accessions of the manuscripts division of the Library of Congress are: miscellaneous papers of Robert R. Livingston, 1775-1776, including the draft of the resolutions offered in the Stamp Act Congress by Robert R. Livingston 1st; papers of John Leeds Bozman and John Leeds Kerr, 1784-1841; papers of Reverdy Johnson, 1826-1876; miscellaneous correspondence of Louis Tousard, 1810-1828; miscellaneous papers of Robert Mills, 1804-1853; miscellaneous letters to Dr. Samuel G. Howe and Julia Ward Howe from Charles Francis Adams, Horace Mann, and Francis Lieber, 1846-1871; a journal of La Pérouse's expedition against the Hudson Bay Company's posts (May-October, 1782), kept by the captain of one of the French ships of war on that expedition (1 vol., pp. 272); a log-book of the U. S. S. *Enterprise*, under the command of David Porter, 1805-1806; a diary of John Evans of his journey from North Dakota over the Rocky Mountains, July-September, 1853; and miscellaneous additions to the Andrew H. Foote papers.

In the last printing of Professor H. W. Elson's well known *History of the United States* (Macmillan, 1917), the narrative has been continued, from 1903 to the re-election of President Wilson, by the addition of some forty pages. No changes have been made in the original plates, with the result that some statements have been left standing which are contradicted in the supplementary matter.

*This Country of Ours: the Story of the United States*, by Henrietta E. Marshall, with pictures in color by A. C. Michael, tells the history of America in story form for boys and girls. The story is brought down to the entrance of the United States into the world war.

*A First Book in American History; with European Beginnings*, by Gertrude Van Duyn Southworth, comes from the press of D. Appleton.

In the September-October issue of the *Magazine of History* are found a brief article on John Quincy Adams and Secession in 1842, by Willis F. Johnson, an account of some price-fixing in 1775, and a continuation of W. M. Thompson's papers bearing the title When Washington Toured New England.

William Abbatt (Tarrytown, New York) has made numerous addi-

tions recently to the collection of reprints known as *Magazine of History Extras*. Among these are: Davis's *Four Principal Battles of the Late War* [of 1812] and Solomon Stoddard's *Answer to some Cases of Conscience* (no. 55); Thomas Ashe's *Carolina* (1682) and the *Narrative of the Sufferings . . . of Capt. John Dean* (1711) (no. 59); and Adalbert J. Volck's *Confederate War Etchings* (no. 60). Nos. 53, 58, and 61 are collections of rare Lincolnia.

Messrs. B. F. Bowen and Company of Indianapolis offer in one volume of 1600 pages a complete text of *The State Constitutions*, edited by Dr. Charles Kettleborough, and well indexed, and promise that an annual supplement will be issued which will keep the compilation up to date.

Harper and Brothers have brought out *The Principles of American Diplomacy*, by John Bassett Moore, revised and enlarged from the author's *American Diplomacy*.

The September-December issue of the *German American Annals* contains a number of tributes to the late Professor Marion D. Learned, its editor. They are from the pens of J. G. Rosengarten, Rudolph Blankenburg, A. B. Faust, David J. Hill, and Henry Wood. There is also a frontispiece portrait of Professor Learned. Clement Vollmer's articles on the American Novel in Germany, 1871-1913, are concluded in this number, closing with a bibliography of American novels published in Germany during the period.

The Smithsonian Institution issues, as *Bulletin 101* of the United States National Museum, a pamphlet of 85 pages on the Columbian Institute for the Promotion of Arts and Sciences, a society which existed in Washington from 1816 to 1838, and which established, under government patronage, a museum and a botanic garden. The author of the pamphlet is Dr. Richard Rathbun, assistant secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

Of the three leading articles in the *Catholic Historical Review* for January, two concern the Philippine Islands, that of Dr. James A. Robertson on Catholicism in the Philippines and that of Dr. Charles H. Cunningham on the Inquisition in the Philippines—both by non-Catholic laymen, and both excellent. The third article, by Archbishop Messmer of Milwaukee, is a collection of notes on Rev. Hercule Brassac, priest in the Mississippi Valley from 1817 to 1837 and vicar-general in Europe of the American bishops from 1839 to 1861, much of whose correspondence with the American bishops is printed, in full text or in extracts.

*The Religious Foundations of America: a Study in National Origins*, by Charles Lemuel Thompson, D.D., is from the press of Revell.

The American Sunday-School Union (Philadelphia) has commemo-



rated its centenary by bringing out *The Sunday-School Movement (1780-1917)* and *the American Sunday-School Union (1817-1917)*, by Edwin W. Rice.

The Macmillan Company announces for publication in April a *History of Labor in the United States*, in two volumes, by Professor John R. Commons of the University of Wisconsin, with collaboration on the part of several others. It is a product of work formerly done under the auspices of the Department of Economics in the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and more recently under those of the Board of Research Associates in American Economic History.

#### ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

John Pory, secretary to Governor Yeardley of Virginia, visited Plymouth in 1622 and wrote to the Earl of Southampton a letter respecting it, never hitherto published. This the Houghton Mifflin Company is about to print, from an old manuscript copy in the John Carter Brown Library, in a volume of special elegance entitled *John Pory's Lost Description of Plymouth Colony in the Earliest Days of the Pilgrim Fathers*, including in the volume at the same time a description by Pory of other early settlements on the New England coast, a full and interesting contemporary account of the Bermudas, a reproduction of Captain John Smith's map of Bermuda, and other facsimiles, the whole edited, with an introduction and notes, by Champlin Burrage, formerly librarian of the library named.

Messrs. Lippincott have brought out a "Mount Vernon Edition" of Mason L. Weems's *Life of Washington*, with new illustrations.

For juvenile readers, few more delightful portrayals of colonial life and character can be found than Miss Laura E. Richards's *Abigail Adams and her Times* (Appleton, pp. 283). The picture, in large part based on the *Familiar Letters* of John and Abigail Adams and the works of Mrs. Alice Morse Earle, is created with much skill and with admirable regard for historical accuracy.

*Napoléon et l'Amérique* (Paris, Payot, 1917) is a study of Napoleon's relations with the United States, by A. Schalck de la Faverie.

The Rowfant Club expects to bring out during the summer a volume of *Documents relating to the Battle of Lake Erie*, edited by Dr. Charles O. Paullin, of the Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Dr. Reginald C. McGrane is editing the papers of Nicholas Biddle for early publication.

*The Political History of the Public Lands, from 1840 to 1862, from Pre-emption to Homestead*, by G. M. Stephenson, is published in Badger's series of *Studies in American History*.

*The Record of a Quaker Conscience: Cyrus Pringle's Diary* (Macmillan), published with an introduction by Professor Rufus M. Jones of Haverford College, is a little book consisting of the personal diary of a young Quaker, drafted for service in the Union army in 1863, but prevented by religious scruples from engaging in war.

In *The Voice of Lincoln*, by R. M. Wanamaker, justice of the supreme court of Ohio, Lincoln is allowed in great measure to reveal himself through liberal quotations from his utterances (Scribner).

*The Life of Lieutenant-General Richard Heron Anderson of the Confederate States Army*, by C. Irvine Walker, has been published in Charleston (Arts Publishing Company).

*Active Service*, by John B. Castleman, is the memoirs of a major in the Confederate army and later a brigadier-general, U. S. A. (Louisville, *Courier Journal*).

*Fifty Years of American Education: a Sketch of the Progress of Education in the United States from 1867 to 1917*, by Ernest C. Moore, was issued in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the house of Ginn and Company.

Among the bulletins of the University of Wisconsin appears, as no. 844, a doctoral thesis by J. W. Oliver (pp. 120), on the *History of the Civil War Military Pensions*.

In the series of volumes of addresses by Hon. Elihu Root, edited by Robert Bacon and James Brown Scott, the volume entitled *North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration at the Hague* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1917, pp. cix, 445) consists of the argument on behalf of the United States by Mr. Root who then—perhaps there is no other similar instance—appeared as chief counsel in an international arbitration which, as Secretary of State, he had prepared and submitted. The historical importance of the argument and of the prefatory material which accompanies it needs no emphasis.

In the *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record* for January is a sketch of Joseph H. Choate, by J. C. Pumpelly; also an Appreciation, by Charles E. Rushmore.

Maj.-Gen. William H. Carter, U. S. A., has prepared a *Life of Lieutenant-General Adna R. Chaffee*, to be published by the University of Chicago Press, a record of the remarkable career of one who rose from the ranks to the highest position in the United States army.

Messrs. Little, Brown and Company have in press, for early publication, a biography of the late George Westinghouse, by Mr. Francis E. Leupp of Washington.

*An Essay towards a Bibliography of the Published Writings and Addresses of Woodrow Wilson, 1910-1917* (pp. 52), by George D. Brown, reference librarian of Princeton University, is a continuation of a similar *Essay towards a Bibliography* for the years 1875-1910, by Harry Clemons. The present compilation brings the record down to March 4, 1917; it is announced that a further continuation and a subject index are in preparation (Library of Princeton University).

#### THE UNITED STATES IN THE WAR

Of the pamphlet entitled *Conquest and Kultur: Aims of the Germans in their own Words*, compiled by Professors Wallace Notestein and Elmer E. Stoll of the University of Minnesota, an edition has now been made available by the Committee on Public Information which differs from that mentioned in our last issue by the insertion of a few additional extracts and by the presence of an index—a great convenience in such a book. The committee has also published part II. of Professor Munro's *German War Practices*, dealing with German treatment of conquered territory.

Four numbers of the *University of Chicago War Papers* have so far appeared, viz.: *The Threat of German World-Politics*, by President Harry P. Judson; *Americans and the World-Crisis*, by Professor Albion W. Small; *Democracy the Basis for World-Order*, by Frederick D. Bramhall; and *Sixteen Causes of the War*, by Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin.

*The Monroe Doctrine and the War*, by Professor Harry G. Plum, is issued as the University of Iowa *Extension Bulletin*, no. 31.

French views of the United States and its participation in the war will be found in *Le Président Wilson, Étude sur la Démocratie Américaine* (Paris, Payot, 1917) by Daniel Halévy; and in *L'Intérêt et l'Idéal des États-Unis dans la Guerre Mondiale* (Paris, Perrin, 1917) by Ferri-Pisani.

#### LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

##### NEW ENGLAND

Sprague's *Journal of Maine History*, in the number for November-December-January, presents the beginning of an alphabetical index of Revolutionary pensioners who lived in Maine, prepared by Charles A. Flagg, librarian of the Bangor Public Library. The present installment of the list runs only half-way through the letter "A", but the bibliographical and other preliminary matter is of value to all searchers after Revolutionary veterans.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the New England Historic Genealogical Society (by aid of the Eddy Town Record Fund) have

printed the vital records, to 1850, of the towns of East Bridgewater, Gloucester (vol. I.), Granville, Greenfield, Salem (vol. I.), and Uxbridge.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has published volume XIX. of the *Acts and Resolves of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay* (pp. 1062), containing resolves, orders, votes, etc., passed at the sessions extending from July 19, 1775, to May 10, 1777. Resolves, orders, and votes to the number of 2294 are embraced in the volume, and, with an elaborate index, enable the student to follow in minute detail the doings of the legislature. A complete print of the legislative records of the Council, or of the House Journals, would not take much more space. There are no annotations except marginal references to sources. We note, as of timely interest, a resolve of October 13, 1775, recommending the corporation and overseers of Harvard College "not to appoint any persons as Governors or Instructors but such whose political principles they can confide in and also to inquire into the principles of such as are now in Office and dismiss those who by their past or present Conduct appear to be unfriendly to the Liberties and Privileges of the Colonies".

The November-December serial of the Massachusetts Historical Society contains an appreciative review of Lord Charnwood's *Abraham Lincoln* by another biographer, Mr. John T. Morse, jr.; a long disquisition on Medieval English Sovereignty, by Professor M. M. Bigelow; and an account of Joseph Badger, and full descriptive list of all known portraits from his hand, by Mr. Lawrence Park.

*Fiction and Truth about the Battle of Lexington Common, April 19, 1775*, is the title of a paper read before the Lexington Historical Society in December by F. W. Coburn.

The *Essex Institute Historical Collections* for January reprints from the *Harvard Theological Review* Professor Francis A. Christie's article on the Diary of an Old New England Minister (William Bentley, 1759-1819). In the same number is found a series of documents relating to Marblehead, Massachusetts (1643-1676), copied from the archives of Massachusetts by John H. Edmunds.

An enlarged edition of Joseph E. Fiske's *History of the Town of Wellesley, Massachusetts*, edited by Ellen W. Fiske, has been published by the author (Wellesley Hills, Massachusetts).

*A History of Conway, Massachusetts, 1767-1917*, "by the People of Conway", edited by Rev. C. S. Pease, is published in Conway by the Field Memorial Library.

The eleventh volume of the Rhode Island Historical Society's *Collections* is being issued in the form of a quarterly historical magazine. The first number appeared in January of this year and contained articles on historical, bibliographical, and genealogical subjects, among them an

article on the recent excavations of the Jireh Bull garrison house in South Kingstown, and one on the Sachem Pomham's fort.

#### MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The Division of Archives and History in the New York State Department of Education expects to issue inventories of the records of counties, cities, towns, and incorporated villages, in a series of pamphlets of which the first, on the records of Smithtown in Suffolk County, is now in press. Other series will open with pamphlets on the records of the county of Suffolk and of the village of Ballston Spa.

The *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting* of the New York State Historical Association, held at West Point in October, 1915, volume XV. of this series (Albany, pp. 357), contains for the most part papers relating to the history of West Point, by various excellent authorities. There is also a valuable paper on Later French Settlements in New York State, 1783-1800, by J. I. Wyer, jr., state librarian, and a statistical account of the origins, dates, and names of the towns and cities of New York, by J. N. Eno.

By undertaking to print the *Minutes of the Common Council of the City of New York* from 1784 to 1831, the city government has provided for filling the last remaining gap in the published records of the common council, or analogous bodies, from the beginning of the records of the burgomasters and schepens of New Amsterdam, in 1653, to the present time. Few matters in American history are more important than the development of this municipality, and these are its fundamental records. They have been edited by Dr. A. E. Peterson, under the auspices of a committee of which Dr. Victor H. Paltsits is chairman, and will make twenty printed volumes, to be issued in 1918, probably, with an index in one or two volumes to follow. Sets will not be given away, but will be sold (below cost) at sixty dollars a set.

In the *New York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin* for January is an article, by Caroline L. Ransome, on the Egyptian Ushebtis belonging to the New York Historical Society. The *Bulletin* publishes a facsimile and translation of a Dutch Thanksgiving Proclamation, June 30, 1674, and a facsimile of the letter from the President of the Continental Congress, Henry Laurens, to the King of France, October 21, 1778, in commendation of Lafayette.

The Onondaga Historical Association (Syracuse, New York) has published the *Moravian Journals relating to Central New York, 1745-1766* (pp. 242), edited by W. M. Beauchamp.

The Buffalo Historical Society has in press volume XXII. of its *Publications*. A considerable part of the volume will be devoted to a history of the University of Buffalo, by Julian Park, secretary of the

arts department of the university. The volume will also contain an account of Niagara ship canal projects, by Hon. Henry W. Hill, president of the society.

The Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies has published *A Bibliography of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, 1745-1912*, by Lottie M. Bausman, the third in its series of county bibliographies and by far the most important (pp. 468).

*The Story of Lancaster, Old and New: being a Narrative History of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, from 1730 to the Centennial Year, 1918*, by William Riddle, is published in Lancaster by the author.

The Wyoming Historical and Geological Society's *Proceedings and Collections* for the year 1917, edited by Horace E. Hayden, has come from the press.

The Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania began with January the issue of a small quarterly publication, *The Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine*, of good promise as to contents and interest. The first number describes the career of the Rev. John Taylor, the first rector of Trinity Episcopal Church of Pittsburgh, a typical pioneer clerical life, and presents extracts from records kept by him; also Judge Brackenridge's record of the trial of Mamachtaga, a Delaware Indian, the first person hanged for murder west of the Allegheny Mountains.

A new edition of Neville B. Craig's *History of Pittsburgh*, with introduction and notes by G. T. Fleming, has appeared (Pittsburgh, J. R. Weldin Company).

#### SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

In the December number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* appear, beside continuations: an installment of materials relating to the Library Company of Baltimore, organized in 1795 and merged with the Maryland Historical Society in 1854; a collection of advertisements taken from the *Baltimore Daily Repository* of 1792-1793, being chiefly the offers of professional services from teachers, doctors, and others; and some correspondence of Governor Sharpe (1763-1768), from transcripts in the Library of Congress.

Among the varied documents printed in the January number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* may be mentioned some minutes of the council and general court relative to a case of witchcraft (1626), letters of William Byrd (1688-1689), some minutes of a committee of trade and plantations in 1681, the tobacco act of 1713, and selections from the Jones Papers in the Library of Congress. This selection includes letters (1725) from Colonel Thomas Jones to Mrs. Pratt, who shortly became his wife; letters (1724-1726) to the same

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—48.

lady from her brother, Catesby Cocke; also a physician's bill to Colonel Jones (1747).

The *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* of January prints Some Fragments of an Intended Report on the Post-Revolutionary History of Agriculture in Virginia, by N. F. Cabell (1807-1891), with notes by E. G. Swem. Professor A. J. Morrison contributes a Note on the Organization of Virginia Agriculture. The German Colony of 1717, by A. L. Keith, is continued.

*William Claiborne of Virginia; with some Account of his Pedigree* (Putnam), by John H. Claiborne, with an introduction by John D. Lindsay, is primarily genealogical in character, but contains an account of the dispute between Claiborne and Lord Baltimore regarding the ownership of Kent Island.

The October number of the *North Carolina Booklet* completes Professor Archibald Henderson's sketch of his ancestor of the same name, A Federalist of the Old School. The same number presents documents respecting a secession declaration of certain North Carolina counties, at Palmyra, October 14, 1860. There is likewise a brief sketch by W. A. Smith of Dr. John Washington Bennett.

In a series of letters of John Rutledge which the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* is printing, with annotations by Joseph W. Barnwell, five letters written by Rutledge as governor to the South Carolina delegates in the Continental Congress, 1781-1782, appear in the October number of the *Magazine*.

The article of Professor R. P. Brooks, "Howell Cobb and the Crisis of 1850", which appeared in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, vol. IV., no. 3, has been reprinted as a *Bulletin of the University of Georgia* (January).

A publication of bi-centenary interest is the *Histoire de la Fondation de la Nouvelle-Orléans, 1717-1722* (Paris, Imp. Nationale, 1917) by Baron Marc de Villiers.

The Historical Society of East and West Baton Rouge expects soon to send to the press the manuscript of volume II. of its *Proceedings*.

#### WESTERN STATES

The December number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* has for its chief contents four articles: one by Professor R. P. Brooks, on Howell Cobb and the Crisis of 1850, seeking to define Cobb's Unionism; one by Mr. Cardinal Goodwin, A Larger View of the Yellowstone Expedition, 1819-1820, the larger view indicated by Calhoun's statement of purposes; and one by Professor Clarence E. Carter, on the Beginnings of West Florida. Mr. Dan E. Clark supplies a survey of the



historical activities of the last two years in the trans-Mississippi Northwest.

Messrs. Lowdermilk of Washington have brought out, with the title *The First Map and Description of Ohio, 1787*, a facsimile of the "Map of the Federal Territory" which Manasseh Cutler caused to be prepared in 1787, together with Cutler's *Explanation of the Map*, etc., which was originally intended to accompany the map but which was in fact issued some months before it. But two copies of the map are known to exist, and only a few copies of the *Explanation* have survived. Mr. P. Lee Phillips, chief of the division of maps in the Library of Congress, contributes a bibliographical account of both.

The *Annual Reports* of the Western Reserve Historical Society (pp. 231), includes the Annual Report for 1916-1917 (pp. 62) and Side Lights on the Ohio Company of Associates from the John May Papers (pp. 63-231). John May (1748-1812) was one of the active founders of the Ohio Company and was agent for a number of the associates. His papers were acquired by the Western Reserve Historical Society in 1909. The papers here printed, which cover the period from 1787 to 1811, include numerous letters of correspondence between May and William Rufus Putnam, some letters of Manasseh Cutler, three maps, and sundry records and statements. One of the maps reproduced is probably a copy of the Cutler map of 1787, mentioned above; another bears the title "Plan des Achats des Compagnies de l'Ohio et de Scioto", and is supposed to have been prepared for use in selling the Scioto lands in France. It is accompanied by Cutler's *Explanation*, which is here retranslated from the French.

The October number of the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* contains an article concerning Col. Henry Bouquet, based chiefly on A. Burnand's *Henry Bouquet, Vainqueur des Peaux-Rouges de l'Ohio* (Neuchâtel, 1909). In the same number Miss Keren J. Gaumer writes concerning Mac-O-Chee Valley, H. L. Peeke concerning Johnson's Island, and Irvén Travis concerning Muskingum River Pilots. There is also a description of the Hayes Memorial at Fremont, Ohio, including a catalogue of the relics, souvenirs, etc., deposited there.

The Department of Indiana History and Archives is arranging for the calendaring of the Lasselle and Tipton collections of manuscripts this spring and summer.

The Indiana Historical Society has recently published a *History of Morgan's Raid in Indiana* (pp. 51), by Judge Louis B. Ewbank of Indianapolis.

In the December number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* J. Edward Murr, using the title Lincoln in Indiana, writes entertainingly

of Lincoln's early life. Charles Zimmerman's paper on the Origin and Rise of the Republican Party in Indiana from 1856 to 1860 is concluded in this number. In the March issue Mr. Murr's paper is continued, and there is a briefer article on Topenbee and the Decline of the Pottawatomie Nation, by Elmore Barce.

The centennial celebration of the entrance of Illinois into the Union in 1818 will be marked by two particular state functions: the one, a centennial meeting of the Illinois State Historical Society, at Springfield, on April 17 and 18, when addresses will be made by President John H. Finley, of the University of the State of New York, M. Louis Aubert, of the French High Commission to the United States, Professors Allen Johnson of Yale University, Elbert J. Benton, of the Western Reserve University, Clarence W. Alvord, of Illinois, Mr. H. J. Eckenrode, of Virginia, and Mr. Charles W. Moores, of Indianapolis; the other, an official celebration in October, accompanied by the dedication of statues of Lincoln and Douglas on the State House grounds.

The *Transactions* of the Illinois State Historical Society for the year 1916 (*Publications*, no. 22, of the Illinois State Library) include the following papers: the First Two Counties of Illinois and their People, by Fred J. Kern; the Veto Power of the Governor of Illinois, by N. H. Debel; the Indian History of Illinois, by Ralph Linton; Early Presbyterianism in East Central Illinois, by Rev. Ira W. Allen; Random Recollections of Sixty Years in Chicago, by William J. Onahan; Slavery and Involuntary Servitude in Illinois, by Orlando W. Aldrich; and the Fox River of Illinois, by John F. Steward.

In the January number of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, under the title Penalties of Patriotism, Joseph J. Thompson writes an Appreciation of the Life, Patriotism, and Services of Francis Vigo, Pierre Gibault, George Rogers Clark, and Arthur St. Clair, the Founders of the Northwest; President Edmund J. James writes a biographical sketch and reminiscences of his father, Rev. Colin Dew James, a pioneer Methodist preacher of early Illinois; Mrs. Katherine Stahl gives some account of two Early Women Preachers of Illinois, Mrs. Hubbard and Mrs. Henry; and William Epler sketches Some Beginnings in Central Cass County.

The Bobbs-Merrill Company has issued a Centennial Edition of *Illinois: the Story of the Prairie State*, by Grace Humphrey.

*The Quarter-Centennial Celebration of the University of Chicago* (University Press, 1918, pp. xii, 234), recorded by Professor David A. Robertson, not only describes with fullness the ceremonies of June 2-6, 1916, but furnishes much material for a knowledge of the history of the institution.

The Michigan Historical Commission has brought out *Lawton Thomas Hemans: a Memorial*, "By the People of Michigan". There is a frontispiece portrait, a biographical sketch by Mrs. Hemans, and numerous tributes.

Mr. Edward G. Holden contributes to the January number of the *Michigan History Magazine* some interesting reminiscences of Carl Schurz in Michigan. Other articles in the *Magazine* are: Indian Legends of Northern Michigan, by John C. Wright; History of the Equal Suffrage Movement in Michigan, by Karolena M. Fox; Coming of the Italians to Detroit, by John C. Vismara; Father Marquette at Michilimackinac, by Edwin O. Wood; Congregationalism as a Factor in the Making of Michigan, by John P. Sanderson; Historical Sketch of the University of Detroit, by President William T. Doran; and the Factional Character of Early Michigan Politics, by Floyd B. Streeter.

No. 5 of Mr. C. M. Burton's *Manuscripts and Records from the Burton Historical Collection* prints the orderly book, for the Tippecanoe campaign, of Col. John P. Boyd, who, after a romantic military career in India, had come home to the command of the 4th United States Infantry. It also continues the correspondence of Governor Harrison, for a similar period, the second half of 1811, which also fills the whole of no. 6. It is a very important series of letters, for the history of the campaign against the Prophet, and also for the biography of Harrison during the period that gave him his chief title to fame. They show him in a favorable light, though when we see him quoting Greek (to Secretary Eustis! and very badly, if the transcriber and printer have not done him injustice) one thinks of the Roman proconsuls whom Webster deposed from his inaugural address.

The Macmillan Company announces for early publication a work by Hon. Edwin O. Wood, in two volumes, entitled *Historic Mackinac*. The work will contain several hundred pictures and a number of folding maps.

The second number (December) of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* contains the annual address delivered before the State Historical Society of Wisconsin in October, 1917, by Professor Carl R. Fish. It is an instructive and suggestive study entitled *The Frontier a World Problem*. The *Magazine* publishes in this number an English translation, by R. B. Anderson, of Ole Knudsen Nattestad's *Description of a Journey to North America (Beskrivelse over en Reise til Nordamerika, begyndt den 8de April 1837, Drammen, 1839)*, of which only one copy of the original is known to exist, that now in the library of the society. An article of interest is *Early Recollections of Lake Geneva (Big Foot Lake)*, Wisconsin, by George Manierre. In the March number of the *Magazine*, under the title *A Wisconsin Woman's Picture of President Lincoln*, is printed the narrative of Mrs. Cordelia A. P. Harvey, de-

scribing her work in the hospitals during the Civil War and in particular some interviews with President Lincoln. In the same number are found an account of the Dutch Settlements of Sheboygan County, by S. F. Rederus; some Pioneer Recollections of Beloit and Southern Wisconsin, by Lucius G. Fisher, edited by M. M. Quaife; and the Chicago Treaty of 1833, with introduction and notes by M. M. Quaife.

In the *Minnesota History Bulletin* of November appears a translation, by Theodore C. Blegen, of Ole Rynning's *True Account of America* (*Sandfaerdig Beretning om Amerika*, Christiania, 1838), of which only one copy of the original is known to the translator. Rynning's pamphlet (39 pp.) was reprinted at Madison in 1896, with the title *Student Ole Rynnings Amerikabog*, but copies of the reprint are also said to be rare. Mr. Blegen furnishes an introduction and notes.

The State Historical Society of Iowa has in press a volume on the *History of Economic Legislation in Iowa*, by Ivan L. Pollock.

Numbers VI., VII., VIII., and IX. of the publication known as *Iowa and War*, published by the State Historical Society of Iowa, are devoted to the following subjects: *Sanitary Fairs: a Method of Raising Funds for Relief Work in Iowa during the Civil War*, by Earl S. Fullbrook; *Old Fort Madison: Early Wars on the Eastern Border of the Iowa Country*, by Jacob Van der Zee; *The State University of Iowa and the Civil War*, by Mrs. Ellen M. Rich; and *The Black Hawk War*, by Jacob Van der Zee.

Two extended articles appear in the January number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*. They are: *Arms and Equipment for the Iowa Troops in the Civil War*, by Cyril B. Upham, and *State Finances in Iowa during the Civil War*. There are also two early reports concerning the Des Moines River, one by W. Bowling Guion, October 9, 1841, and the other by John C. Frémont, April 14, 1842, together with a letter of Frémont, December 10, 1842.

Contributions to the January number of the *Missouri Historical Review* are: an historical sketch of Missouri-Montana Highways, by H. A. Trexler; the second installment of Gottfried Duden's Report, translated by William G. Bek; a second article on Missouri and the War, by Floyd C. Shoemaker; and an appreciative sketch of George Creel, by I. H. Epperson.

*Corn among the Indians of the Upper Missouri*, by G. F. Will and G. E. Hyde, is a recent addition to the series of *Little Histories of North American Indians* (St. Louis, William Harvey Miner Company).

The Arkansas Historical Association has just brought out volume IV. of its *Publications* (pp. 460), in which are articles on the state's constitutional convention of 1874, on its official flag, its history commission, and its mounds, on Captain V. M. McGehee, David O. Dodd, John Pope,

and Michael S. Kennard, and on many more local matters, and a narrative of a journey in the prairie by Albert Pike.

Articles in the January number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* are: the Government of Austin's Colony, 1821-1831, by Professor Eugene C. Barker; the Residencia in the Spanish Colonies, by Dr. Charles H. Cunningham; and the Powers of the Commander of the Confederate Trans-Mississippi Department, 1863-1865, by Florence E. Holladay. The latter is to be continued. There is also a first installment of the Minutes of the Ayuntamiento of San Felipe de Austin, 1828-1832, edited by Professor Barker.

*History and Legends of the Alamo and other Missions in and around San Antonio*, by Adina de Zavala, is published in San Antonio by the author.

The *Texas History Teachers' Bulletin*, November 15, 1917, includes translations of two letters of Pope Innocent III., 1198-1199, relating to the Fourth Crusade, contributed by Milton R. Gutsch; and ten letters written to Stephen F. Austin between November, 1821, and March, 1822, contributed by Eugene C. Barker.

Volume XVIII. of the *Publications* of the Nebraska State Historical Society, edited by Albert Watkins, its historian (Lincoln, 1917, pp. xiii, 449), contains memorials of the late Clarence S. Paine and others, and articles on the Rural Carrier in 1849, on Trailing Texas Long-horned Cattle through Nebraska, on Neapolis, and on the struggle for the admission of the state. The society has lately reduced to chronological and alphabetical order the papers, valuable to Nebraska history, of Governor Robert W. Furnas, Judge Samuel Maxwell, and Judge Samuel M. Chapman, papers long in its possession. In February it began the issue of a popular monthly paper entitled *Nebraska History and Record of Pioneer Days*.

*The Exercise of the Veto Power in Nebraska*, by Knute E. Carlson, constitutes *Bulletin* no. 12, of the Nebraska History and Political Science Series, a joint publication of the Nebraska State Historical Society and the Nebraska Legislative Reference Bureau.

*A Standard History of Kansas and Kansans*, in five volumes, by W. E. Connelley, is put forth by the Lewis Publishing Company.

*The Formation of the State of Oklahoma, 1803-1906*, by Roy Gittinger, Ph.D., constitutes vol. VI. of the *University of California Publications in History*. In the history of our state-making Oklahoma holds a unique position. Constituted mainly from the Louisiana Purchase, the territory was early set apart for the Indians, with a consequent delay in its occupation by white settlers and its admission as a state. The steps in the creation of this "Indian Territory" are outlined by the author in three introductory chapters. In nine other chapters is related the history

of the territory from the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the effort to create the state of Neosho in 1854 to the admission of Oklahoma in 1906. There are five maps; also nine appendixes of notes and documents, and a bibliography.

*Pioneering the West, 1846 to 1878: Major Howard Egan's Diary*, is the principal title of a small volume published at Richmond, Utah, by the Howard R. Egan Estate. Much of the matter in the volume is from the pen of Howard R. Egan, the son, and the whole has been compiled and edited by W. M. Egan.

In *Nevada Historical Society Papers, 1913-1916* (Carson City, 1917, pp. 221), the secretary of the society, Miss Jeanne E. Wier, has assembled a number of interesting papers commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the admission of the state and other portions of its history, such as the last Indian uprising in Nevada, and religious development in the state. She also presents a paper on Mark Twain's Relations to Nevada and to the West.

Volume VIII. of *Contributions* of the Historical Society of Montana (Helena, 1917, pp. 376), contains articles upon the pioneer courts of the state, upon pioneer lumbering, upon the Yellowstone Expedition of 1874, upon Captain Townsend's battle on the Powder River, upon the boundary survey between Montana and Dakota, and upon various individuals connected with the state.

Articles in the January number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* are: an account of Alaska Whaling, by Clarence L. Andrews; David Thompson's journal of two journeys in the Spokane country in 1811, with introduction and notes by T. C. Elliott; a survey of the Pioneer and Historical Associations in the State of Washington, by Victor J. Farrar; a continuation of Professor Edmond S. Meany's papers on the Origin of Washington Geographic Names; and a statement, by President Henry Suzzallo, of the organization of the Washington War History Committees.

G. P. Putnam's Sons have issued a revised and enlarged edition of W. D. Denison's *The Columbia River: its History, its Myths, its Scenery, its Commerce*.

Leslie M. Scott contributes to the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* for September a study of the Pioneer Stimulus of Gold. F. W. Powell's biography of Hall Jackson Kelley is continued. The *Quarterly* for December contains the relevant portion of the log of H. M. S. *Chatham*, which accompanied Vancouver and the *Discovery* at the time of his entrance into the Columbia River, a selection from various writings of Harvey W. Scott, concerning early Oregon (Mr. Scott was for forty years editor of the *Morning Oregonian*), and a reprint of Hall J. Kelley's memorial of 1839 addressed to Caleb Cushing. The society has lately entered upon the occupancy of new quarters in a fireproof building, the Auditorium of the city of Portland.

*California: the Name*, by Miss Ruth Putnam, with the collaboration of Dr. Herbert I. Priestley, of the University of California (University of California *Publications*, vol. IV., no. 4, pp. 293-365), is an interesting investigation of the earliest uses of the name and discussion of its origin, discovered long ago by the late Dr. E. E. Hale, accompanied by a section of the Diego Gutierrez map of 1562, the first upon which the name appears.

AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

The first number of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* is upon the point of being published. The organization effected at Philadelphia in December provided for a board of editors numbering six and for two advisory editors. For membership in the Board of Editors choice was made of Professors Charles E. Chapman, of California, Isaac J. Cox, of Cincinnati, Julius Klein, of Harvard, William R. Manning, of Texas, Dr. James A. Robertson, of Washington, and Professor William S. Robertson, of Illinois, while Professors Herbert E. Bolton, of the University of California, and William R. Shepherd, of Columbia, were elected as advisory editors. The Board has chosen Dr. James A. Robertson as managing editor. The first number of the journal is to embrace an account of the founding of the *Review*, by Dr. Chapman, an article on the Institutional Background of Spanish American History, by Dr. Charles H. Cunningham, of Texas, one on the Delimitation of Political Jurisdictions in Spanish North America to 1535, by Dr. Charles W. Hackett, of California, one on the Recognition of the Spanish Colonies by the Motherland, by Dr. W. S. Robertson, and book reviews and notes. To the bibliographical section, Señor J. T. Medina, of Santiago de Chile, chief of Hispanic American bibliographers, makes a contribution concerning certain books of travel.

Señor Segundo de Ispizua has published, as an additional volume of his *Los Vascos en América* (Madrid, *La Italica*, 1917, pp. 438) his two "books" on the conquest and colonization of Panama and on the discovery and conquest of Peru.

Expressions of Latin-American sympathy with the Allied cause have been collected by Francisco Contreras in *Les Écrivains Hispano-Américains et la Guerre Européenne* (Paris, Bossard, 1917). An article by C. Silva-Vildosola has been translated by Cardozo de Bethencourt with the title *Le Chili et la Guerre* (Paris, Alcan, 1917, pp. 71).

*Mexico: From Diaz to the Kaiser*, by Mrs. Alec Tweedie, is from the press of George M. Doran Company.

The hitherto unpublished portion of Fray Pedro de Aguado's *Historia de Santa Marta y Nuevo Reino de Granada* (Madrid, Ratés, 1917) is contained in the second volume of the edition which has been prepared with introduction and notes by Jerónimo Becker.



Though not primarily a book of history, the *Guide to the Law and Legal Literature of Argentina, Brazil, and Chile*, prepared under the auspices of the Library of Congress, by Professor Edward M. Borchard, now of the Yale Law School (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1917, pp. 523), contains a great amount of legal and bibliographical material valuable to the student of South American history.

The section of history in the faculty of philosophy and letters in the University of Buenos Aires has begun a series of *Publicaciones* (Buenos Aires, 1917), of which three numbers have already been brought out: *La Administracion de Temporalidades en el Rio de la Plata*, by Dr. Luis Maria Torres; *Constituciones del Real Colegio de San Carlos*, by Dr. Emilio Ravignani, and *Valores Aproximados de Algunas Monedas Hispano-Americanas (1497-1771)*, by Dr. Juan Alvarez. These publications and their successors the faculty named will be happy to exchange against serial publications in history from universities in the United States.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. C. Moore Smith, *Robert Hayman and the Plantation of Newfoundland* (English Historical Review, January); C. E. Carter, *British Policy towards the American Indians in the South, 1763-1768* (*ibid.*); Sir E. Fremantle, *Sea Power and the American War of Independence* (Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, August); Grace M. Pierce, *Pension Laws of the Revolution* (Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine, March); S. A. Ashe, *Some New Light on John Paul Jones* (South Atlantic Quarterly, January); R. de Cárdenas, *La Política de los Estados Unidos en el Continente Americano*, I. (Cuba Contemporánea, January); H. S. Quigley, *The American Attitude toward Capture at Sea* (American Journal of International Law, October); T. R. Powell, *Decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on Constitutional Questions, 1914-1917*, I. (American Political Science Review, February); Lieut.-Col. M. B. Stewart, *Building the National Army* (Scribner's Magazine, February); M. Turmann, *La Première Présidence de M. Wilson, 1913-1917* (Revue Hebdomadaire, October 13); Maj. Robert E. Wylie, *The Quebec Campaign of 1759*, concl. (Journal of the Military Service Institution, November-December); G. Desdevises du Dezert, *L'Église Espagnole des Indes à la Fin du Dix-huitième Siècle* (Revue Hispanique, February, 1917); Ledeuil d'Enquin, *La Dernière Phase de l'Expédition de Saint-Domingue, les Généraux Ferrand et Barquier, 1803-1809* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, November); C. A. Villanueva, *Napoléon y los Diputados de América en las Cortes Españolas de Bayona* (Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia, 1917, July-September); *id.*, *French Diplomacy in Latin America* (Inter-America, February); Dr. Alejandro Alvarez, *The Monroe Doctrine from the Latin-American Point of View* (St. Louis Law Review, November); W. F. Slade, *The Federation of Central America*, cont. (Journal of Race Development, October).